TERMS OF SUBSCRIPTION.

The *National Era* is published every Thursday, on the following terms:

Single copy, one year	$2.00
Three copies, one year	5.00
Five copies, one year	8.00
Ten copies, one year	15.00
Single copy, six months	1.00
Ten copies, six months	8.00

Voluntary agents are entitled to retain 50 cents commission on each yearly, and 25 cents commission on each semi-yearly, subscriber, *except in the case of Clubs*.

A Club of five subscribers, at $8, will entitle the person making it up to a copy for 6 months; a Club of ten, at $15, to a copy for one year. When a Club has been forwarded, additions may be made to it, on the same terms.

THE NATIONAL ERA.

G. BAILEY, EDITOR AND PROPRIETOR; JOHN G. WHITTIER, CORRESPONDING EDITOR.

VOL. X. WASHINGTON, D. C., THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 18, 1856. NO. 507.

RATES OF ADVERTISING.

Ten cents a line for the *first* insertion, *five* cents a line for each subsequent one. Ten words constitute a line. Payment in advance is invariably required.

☞ Money may be forwarded, by mail, at *my risk*. Notes on Eastern banks preferred. Large amounts may be remitted in drafts or certificates of deposit.

☞ Subscribers wishing their papers changed, will give the name of the post office changed *from*, as well as the post office they wish it hereafter sent *to*.

☞ All communications to the *Era*, whether on business of the paper or for publication, should be addressed to

G. BAILEY, *Washington, D. C.*

WASHINGTON, D. C.

For the National Era.

FASHIONABLE FOOTPRINTS.

BY MRS. BELL SMITH.

Part II.

Life at a fashionable watering-place in the East has been too faithfully depicted by the author of "The Upper Ten Thousand," for me to add to, or differ from, his graphic pictures. Had the scene of his sketches been laid at Harrodsburg (our Baden Baden) or Drennon, he would have found a greater range of character, and a wider field for a new book, than in the burlesque imitations of Parisian life, so long the style in Eastern places of summer resort. The great Southwest, with all its wealth, intellect, and enterprise, has not yet socially been worn into grooves, along which trains glide heavily with great safety and sameness. Not so with us, and the fact is strongly exhibited at our favored places of resort during the summer. The word fashionable, as used elsewhere, is not applicable to them. We have no exclusives—"our set" is unknown. The human family, variously represented, meet on common ground, and find in the variety more pleasure than the safety of exclusion would pay for the absence of. Men of wealth are there, with wives and daughters, because time so passed is really pleasant—professional men, seeking relaxation and health, are there the most delightful of idlers—politicians meet to plan future campaigns, and among them all are found the most amusing and interesting characters, exhibiting themselves fearlessly, with more or less success, and giving variety to the woof of common life. Farces are really acted to be laughed at, and life's tragedies played out as we only read of in books, and attribute to the imagination of novelists. How different all this from where the dull routine of dancing and bathing is—where, without even the variety of waves, we have the sameness of the ocean.

Western society is more influenced by the South than by the East, or Eastern traditions of Parisian life. The result is, we have more freedom of intercourse, ease of manner, and real good breeding—for, be it observed, our Southern friends, feeling secure in their position, are not hampered by the restraint that makes uncomfortable the gentlemen who look down upon labor as something which once disgraced their families. Having risen above buttons, we must beware of all strangers, lest under a decent exterior there lurks a pestilent button-maker.

Few arrivals ever created the sensation at Newport as did this of our little heroine. As I have said, the fame of her beauty, accomplishments, and great wealth, had preceded her. She was surrounded by admirers during the day, and serenaded half the night, and it is a high compliment to say that her little head was not completely turned. She received all homage as demure and quietly as if not herself the centre of such attraction. A week after their arrival, while Mrs. Colburn was promenading the vast hall of the Ocean House, dividing her ears between the sweet strains of the Germania Band and the stupid talk of an eminent Senator, Juliet came to her more than usually hurried, and said, in a whisper, while her cheeks flushed and eyes shone with mischief:

"Mr. O'Halloran is here."

"Indeed! Have you seen him?"

"No; but I heard him. Everybody can hear him—there he is."

Sure enough; a hearty peal of laughter abruptly terminated as at the turn of the hall the ladies suddenly met a handsome specimen of Young Ireland, who grasped the hand of each, and, in a very musical, mellow voice, with the slightest perceptible brogue, declared he was the happiest man this side of matrimony—that he had neither slept nor ate since Miss Juliet had left a vast population perfectly wretched in her absence—and that he had travelled night and day to bask once more in the sunlight of beauty. This, almost shouted, made Juliet laugh merrily, and in an instant they were together, promenading before the envious crowd.

Victor O'Halloran's introduction to the divine Juliet was singularly Irish. He had come to the city almost unknown, without letters, although he might have commanded the best endorsements, and began the study of the law. He had been admitted to the bar, and, in command of a good practice at home, but, having taken part in the unhappy efforts of Mitchel and Smith O'Brien, he was forced to fly, and, after some narrow escapes, succeeded in reaching the United States. He studied our law, as an Irish lawyer may be supposed to do who has no society, and is grievously *ennuied* at not knowing how else to kill time. He was acquainted with no families in the city, and seemed to have little hope of making one in any social circle.

He rushed into the office one day, in a high state of excitement, and informed his fellow-students that he had met an angel. They had no rest until he had discovered the name and residence of his divinity. The angel was Juliet Deming. After soliciting various persons to introduce him, which they could not very well do, being unacquainted themselves, he announced his intention, publicly, to the office, of visiting the divine girl without an introduction.

"Victor," said one of his fellow-students, "you will be kicked out at the front door, and, in all human probability, that exercise will be continued some distance down the street."

The only response to this was a very indignant look, as the young Irishman, handsomely equipped, sallied forth. Arriving at the aristocratic mansion, he rang the bell, inquired for Miss Deming, and was ushered into the drawing-room where Juliet was. Thinking the handsome stranger, who stood bowing before her, wished to see her father, she asked him to be seated. O'Halloran, perfectly self-possessed, entered into conversation, and to the remark that her father would be in soon, responded, "that he could wait, with delight, for an age, in such a presence." The conversation continued for a short time, but sufficiently long for Juliet to appreciate the intellect and original humor of the strange visiter. When O'Halloran again called, he stumbled upon old Mr. Deming, who, thinking him one of his daughter's admirers, had half an hour's conversation, in which he entirely ingratiated himself with the old gentleman, by information as varied as it was graphically used.

Victor's fellow-students were perfectly astounded at seeing their companion not only intimate with the Demings, but, through them, visiting many agreeable families. The Demings had the intellect to appreciate Mr. O'Halloran's real cultivation and frank honesty and standing, sufficient to insure respect in any circle to which they might introduce him. Devotedly attached to Juliet, he had followed her to Newport, and was untiring in his attentions.

The gay season wore on, and Juliet, "followed, flattered, sought, and sued," found amusement in an obedience to her own inclination, that made gossips wonder. Saratoga water and air are good for invalids—sea-bathing at Newport strengthens as much—but one thing flourishes in wonderful health, although tonics are needless. I mean Madam Rumor's twin sister, Gossip. She is everywhere, almost, and if not, as an eminent divine once said of the great adversary, "she makes up in activity what she lacks in ubiquity." She chats in the rooms, whispers in the corridors, bathes on the beach, rides to the fort, and mixes in the mazes of the dance, giving to that fashionable heel-insanity more life and spirit than music itself.

This lady would have disposed of my little heroine at once, but for the singular conduct which divided the idlers into two parties, each determined to establish their own notion. One party gave over Juliet, lands, cash, stock, and all, to the handsome Irishman; the other, perfectly indignant at the stupid absurdity of the thing, made her the future bride of Lieutenant Wardour. The Lieutenant was, strange to say, a modest navy officer. He had put a girdle round the earth, without

"Suffering a sea change
Into something rich and strange,"

which the gallant gentlemen of our immortal navy so generally present. He was modest, exceedingly modest; when we remember the fact that he was young, rather handsome, and possessed a mind stored with instruction and amusement—only at the service, however, of those who would go to the labor of mining them out from beneath his mountain of diffidence. His manner of becoming acquainted with Juliet, for a day set Newport in a roar.

Lieutenant Wardour accompanied Captain Wattles to Newport. The captain was a prim, nervous, dressy old bachelor, who would have things just so, and to such an extent that he went by the name of Old Orderly among his more immediate acquaintances. Looking over the list of denizens, he discovered in Mrs. Colburn, the daughter of an old friend. To consume an hour or more over his toilet, and then pay his respects, was a matter of course. Unfortunately for him, that very morning O'Halloran had informed Mrs. Colburn of the arrival of an old friend of his, a Captain Waters, who was a very entertaining gentleman, but, unfortunately, deaf. Mrs. Colburn did not hear the name distinctly, and when afterwards Captain Wattles's card was presented, she confounded the persons.

"Why, Juliet, here is Mr. O'Halloran's friend. Singular he should call on us, and he is so very deaf."

Further comment was cut short by the entrance of the victim. Prim and precise, he entered, and elaborately bowed himself into a seat.

"How do you like Newport?" began Mrs. Colburn, in a loud voice.

"Madam!" said the Captain, startled at the manner of address.

"Is this your first visit?" she asked, varying her question, but still elevating her voice, thinking she had not been heard.

"Why, no—yes"—stammered the unfortunate; truly—yes, indeed."

"Juliet," said Mrs. Colburn, in her ordinary tone, "this really is too much; but I must say something." Then, almost shrieking, she continued:

"We are more thronged than usual this season." (To Juliet:) "I cannot continue; say something, Juliet."

"I can't, aunt; it is too ridiculous."

"You must." (To the Captain in a shrill scream:) "Have you heard the Germania band?"

"Not had that pleasure, madam; indeed, I am so unfortunate as to have no ear for music."

"Of course not. The man, Juliet, must think I'm a fool to ask such a question." Then, in the same wild, frantic shout to the Captain:

"The beach here is very fine, but you have tried it, of course. Juliet, do say something—I'm exhausted—for Heaven's sake, assist me."

"I positively cannot. What shall I say?"

"Say—say anything. Ask the old post if he's acquainted with many here; how long he's been from sea."

Juliet looked helplessly at her guardian; then at the old gentleman, gathered all her strength for a mighty effort. Her aunt, despairing of assistance, began again. The result was, that both screamed "Captain," and then, frightened at their own fearful noise, stopped suddenly.

Captain Wattles looked wildly from one to the other. Juliet blushed from suppressed laughter, Mrs. Colburn from shame, and the last made one more effort to be pleasantly entertaining—sometimes talking in her ordinary tone, from behind her fan to Juliet, then screaming frightfully at the captain.

"I fear we do not make ourselves understood." (Lower.) "Who on earth could?" (Higher.) "I hope we'll become better acquainted." (Lower.) "It will result in my death if we do. You must go with us and hear the Rev. Mr. Evangel to-morrow." (Lower.) "There, I have done it again; it would be miraculous if he were to. What under heavens, Juliet, was this old gander turned loose for?"

Captain Wattles could bear no more—seizing his hat and cane, and bowing hurriedly, he rushed from the parlor, leaving Mrs. Colburn and Juliet in a maze of wonder.

Captain Wattles retreated ingloriously to his apartment, which he entered in a manner bordering on distraction. Giving his hat a fling across the room, his cane after it, and his gloves after both, he informed the astounded lieutenant that he had been insulted, abused, and laughed at. He detailed, with many strong expressions, between pauses, the interview of the morning. Wardour laughed until he fairly rolled from the sofa to the floor, declaring "it was the richest thing he had ever met with."

"But, my dear boy," said the captain, "what the devil do the women mean?"

"Why, captain, it is very evident the elder of the two, or both, perhaps, are deaf, or confoundedly hard of hearing, and, like all persons in that situation, thought you could not hear them. Try again."

"Never!" ejaculated the captain; "I'll see 'em —— first. Why, the old one called me a gander, and wondered what I was let loose for."

Another roar of laughter from Wardour followed this announcement. "Come, come, captain," he said, as soon as he recovered, "try it again. I'll go along, and see you out. You may take me under your wing. Gander! Ho! ho!"

"Well, if you will really stand by me, I will make another attempt, for the young lady is deuced pretty."

On the following morning, accompanied by young Wardour, the captain once more sought the presence of our friends. When they entered, they found Mrs. Colburn alone. She would have exhibited great dismay, had not politeness trained her features. The Captain, remembering his instructions, bowed, and, in a loud, round, sonorous voice, as if hailing a seventy-four, introduced his friend. Wardour took his seat, leaving the conversation to be carried on by the senior.

"I was afraid you were indisposed, captain, you left us so suddenly upon yesterday," screamed Mrs. Colburn.

"I was, indeed, indisposed," responded the captain, in as loud a key, and then, adding, in his natural tone, "hit her then, Jack!"

Had not Mrs. Colburn been thoroughly schooled against dramatic surprises, astonishment would have disconcerted her at once; but, looking as if she had not heard a word, she continued:

"You're fond of the sea, captain, and so am I. Nothing delights me so much as listening to its continuous roar."

"It must be very pleasant," retorted the captain, loudly—adding, in a low tone, to Wardour, "she takes on airs, Jack!" Then, addressing Mrs. Colburn, he asked, "Do you find sea-bathing beneficial? We have a glorious beach here; the safest, I believe, in the United States." Then, subsiding into a low key, he said, "Talk, Jack, I'm out of wind—she's deaf as a post."

Lieutenant Wardour was about hailing Mrs. C. at the top of his voice, when she quietly informed him that she sympathised sincerely with the captain in his distressing infirmity—which his friend, Mr. O'Halloran, had kindly informed her of before his arrival.

The captain and lieutenant stared at each other in perfect amazement. At length the captain broke the silence by asking:

"Jack, what's to be done now? Who the devil is O'Halloran?"

"Madam," said Lieutenant Wardour, "there is some strange mistake here. Captain Wattles is not at all deaf, and I believe you are not."

"Dear me," exclaimed Mrs. Colburn, "what a singular blunder. Mr. O'Halloran certainly informed us that the captain was very deaf."

"I do not know Mr. O'Halloran, madam—I never saw the gentleman—I cannot understand why he should make free use of my name, or deprive me of any faculty. Did he say Wattles, madam?—Captain Wattles?"

"Why—yes. I think that was the name; perhaps Juliet can tell us," she added, turning to that lady, as she entered the room, and introducing her.

"Yes, aunt," she replied; "I have just had the pleasure of seeing the deaf captain, and his name is Waters."

A merry peal of silvery laughter terminated the sentence, as the scene of the day before entered her mind. The laughter melted the embarrassment, and they all joined in.

[TO BE CONTINUED.]

For the National Era.

CANT.

BY GAIL HAMILTON.

Oh! it is very warm. The thermometer stands many degrees higher than it did last winter. If then, when we were all burrowing in snow-banks, Dr. Doremus had broached his theory that the earth has begun to freeze at the poles, and is going to freeze all the way down, we should have marvelled at the prophetic power of science, and done homage to the seer, with an anticipatory shiver at our approaching congelation; but now—now, when the inflexible, unflinching, uncompromising old sun pours a double broadside on us all day long; when ever-stretching, never-ending, red brick walls assume an intenser scarlet, and blear at us fiendishly; when the broad flag-stones of the pavement are but so many witch-tests that we cross not unscathed; now this gossip of advancing icebergs and a general rigidity falls on our heated, heavy ears, like the vain babblings of a fool.

At such a temperature as this, it behooves men to be sensible. Gilt and tinsel answer very well for certain latitudes; but with the thermometer ranging from 98° to 104° in the shade, human nature does not patiently tolerate "shams." In the calm complacency of a balmy spring morning, we look down with a serene smile on the follies of the world. We assume a calm and quiet superiority, give it a pat on the shoulder, and say, condescendingly, "yes, you will do very well; a little rickety in the joints; a slight softening of the brain; but very passable for your riches." Nothing can exceed our amiability when we are pleased and comfortable; but, floundering up to the neck in July; keeping the breath of life in us only by becoming amphibious and web-footed, bound to the earth by no stronger tie than ice cream and sherbet; wooing to our side every passing breeze, as if it were the King's daughter; then, coming "betwixt the wind and our nobility," is the spear of Ithuriel to our smiling good nature, and we feel disposed to pluck its eyes out with a demoniac delight.

Alas! that would be an Herculean task. Cant is the rock foundation, the iron pillar, the gilded cornice, of modern society. Cant walks up and down the earth in broad noon. He has ruddy cheeks and eyes standing out with fatness. He is clad in purple and fine linen, and fares sumptuously every day. But not only glides over the velvet carpets of the rich; he treads heavily on the bare floors of the poor. He mingles his breath with the perfumes of violets and pansies, no less than with the miasma of a great city's thousand odors.

How many of the opinions and principles, which go to make up our mental character, do we hold, because of a sincere and rational conviction that they are just, and true, and right? We do battle for them bravely; we would march to the stake without shrinking, in their defence; but is it because we believe that their maintenance and promulgation are absolutely essential to the world's salvation? Is it not rather because *they are ours*? We are stiff Orthodox Christians; is it because, after thorough and careful research, logical analysis, profound thought, and humble prayer, we cannot choose but bow before a Triune God? or is it because we blindly and unthinkingly follow in the footsteps of our fathers, and worship as they worshipped? All honor to the religion we learned at the mother's knee. Earth knows no purer; can Heaven teach a holier? In her stern contest with the world, the soul needs all her armor. Whatever of protection against sin there may be in the loveliness of home, in the sacredness of maternal love, in the undying associations of the past, we need them all. When the billows pass over us, when our feet are almost gone, our steps have well nigh slipped; when we are swayed to and fro by every wind of doctrine, how do we long, with unutterable longings, to go back to the simplicity of our early faith. But this I ask, Shall I inconsiderately silver a lance against those who, for all I know, are beggars in all that made my childhood beautiful, and a thing to be looked back upon with undefined and indefinable tenderness? Shall I entrench myself in my ancestral Orthodoxy, and hurl terrible epithets at outsiders—infidel, atheist, transcendentalist, heretic—when, after all, the sole difference may be, I first smoked the vital air at Andover, and they did not? Shall I wax fierce with an unmitigated Know Nothingism, when I remember that at this moment I should be devoutly repeating Aves and Pater Nosters, if St. Patrick had but smiled upon my birth? Far better that I should quietly fear God, honor the powers that be—Heaven save the mark—and use my earnest endeavors to win men to that love of Christ which passeth knowledge.

I can see your lip curl with a sinister smile when I direct your attention to the outcry that has been raised against *hoops*. It seemeth to you a full, doth it not, my countryman? But let me assure you, you will do well to repress ill-timed mirth. Petticoats, sir, lay hold of the past, and stretch forward to the future. (Let no profane scoffer say this is on account of their overweening bulk.) And he has little insight into the hidden springs of action, who can dismiss them with a sneer. It is very possible that the character of the next generation depends quite as much on the petticoats which our girls are wearing, as on the sermons which they are hearing. Therefore I take occasion to impress upon your mind the fact that a great outcry has been raised against hoops. Has been? nay, it still goes up to heaven, from every city, village, and hamlet. In one respect, our great and glorious Republic (may her shadow never be less!) knows no East nor West, no North nor South, viz: in the ridicule which every section of her vast domain has conspired to heap on this unoffending article of feminine apparel. Newspapers, for months, have teemed with stories of the evils entailed on the ill-starred wearers thereof. Whirlwinds have borne them heavenward; dray-carts have thrust them earthward; crowds have crushed them inward, vanity expanded them outward. Parties have been deferred, matches broken up, modest men victimized, sensible men repelled, and inconceivable horror brooded over the world. No class of society is exempt from the besetting opinion. The simple-minded country mother, hearing thereof, beats her eggs with a quicker and more vigorous stroke, and descants vehemently on the worldliness of the world. The city matron, with her dignified presence, robed in satin, clouded with laces, glittering with diamonds, pendulous with cherries, raises slowly her jewelled finger, nods deprecatingly her horticultural head, and goes on her smiling way, eminently satisfied with her own independence of fashion's caprices. Grave editors, with the weight of a nation's destiny resting on their individual shoulders, can find no better way to save the Union than to sit in their easy chairs and pen long editorials about the cut of a woman's petticoat. Supercilious clerks lounge at their shop doors, with their patent kids elevated at an angle of forty-five degrees, and ogle each other when the whalebone passes by. Great boys wax clandestinely jocose, and little boys laugh outright.

This has gone on long enough. It is high time that men should be summoned to the bar of outraged common sense, and forced to give a reason for the remarkably hard road they have seen fit to travel. Come out from your dens, ye editors! Come from the shelter of your plural incognitos, and show cause, if there be any, why sentence of eternal stultification should not be pronounced upon you. In the depths of your guilty souls, you know that not one in ten, not one in twenty, not one in a hundred, has any definite, well-grounded, solid principle on the subject; but it is the fashion to laugh—so, the wire being pulled, ten thousand puppets at once fall a tittilating.

Some æsthetic wiseacre, "taller by the breadth of my nail than any of his contemporaries," fresh from the perusal of an Art Journal, exclaims, with ill-concealed exultation, "it is contrary to the rules of beauty. It gives an unnatural outline to the figure. The true ideal of lightness and grace is small at the base, enlarging upward." It may be very true that this is the ideal of our nice young men; with the slight alteration of being, not only small at the base, but small all the way up, and infinitesimally small all the way through. I readily admit that the general style, the *tone* of female dress at the present day, is not in accordance with classic taste. The stiff, straight lines, the general bulkiness, the unnatural compression and equally unnatural expansion, are immeasurably inferior to the sweeping curves and careless folds of the loose, airy, falling, floating drapery, that lent such an indescribable charm to the severity of Grecian beauty. But all this is entirely impertinent and foreign. If the question were, Shall our women array themselves according to the Anglo-American ideas of the nineteenth century, or according to the Grecian ones of the Greek's palmiest days? the comparison would be entirely relevant. I do not say that this question is not worthy the serious attention of benevolent minds, though, before actually advocating such a change, we should do well to remember that very few of our fair countrywomen have that roundness of form and fullness of outline which so primitive an attire demands; and that what may have been artistically perfect on Helen of Troy, will be likely to lose some of its beauty on the wiry form of Sally Jones.

But this is entirely foreign to the matter in hand. The point immediately under consideration is, taking the present style of dress as it is, what is the particular bearing of hoops thereupon. Now I unhesitatingly affirm, without fear of contradiction, but rather in the confident expectation of an enthusiastic support from the initiated, that whalebone skirts are a benefit and a blessing to womanhood. And you, "most potent, grave, and reverend seigniors"—you, who set yourselves up as umpires in this matter—you, who never wore a petticoat in your lives, or since you knew your right hand from your left, I do as little hesitate to inform you, with all due respect, that you don't in the least know what you are talking about. Put on eleven quilted petticoats, and walk up Broadway; then doff them for the hoop, and walk down again, and I dare predict the effect will be as magical as that of burnt pig on the Chinese functionaries. A sudden light will break in upon your benighted mind. You will gain more practical information than a decade of years would bring you. From a cool conservative, you will become a furious radical. A little while ago, when the requisite outline was obtained by means of these wadded and quilted anomalies, you were loud in your denunciations: "They were ruinous to the health," "heavy with the germs of disease," "would infallibly blast the future hopes of Young America." Well, women, as ever, bearing and forbearing, docile and humble, always ready to accept good advice and amend their errors, betook themselves to thinking; and the result was, the substitution of the light elastic whalebone for the heavy cumbrous quilts. Remedied was the very evil which you had been so long deploring—the desired expansion produced without injury to the health; and with the addition of such a degree of physical comfort, such a blissful sense of relief, that women could scarcely credit the evidence of their senses. Now, what could you be expected to do, but sit down in quiet, heartfelt thankfulness, feeling that the world was safe for at least one generation? On the contrary, what have you done, but raise a hue and cry, as if the Union were tumbling about our ears? You madly strive, with all your puny strength, to destroy the edifice whose corner-stone your own hands laid. You would ruthlessly raze to the ground the fair fabric which feminine skill has so patiently reared. For this there is no law. No court of justice takes cognizance of such an offence. It is a crime without a name.

But, remember, there is a point where forbearance ceases to be a virtue. The day of reckoning comes apace. Gutta percha is not yet extinct.

There is yet another resource, viz: to leave off hoops, quilts, and all kindred contrivances, and wear only as much as comfort requires. But would this be an improvement, even in appearance? Do you really think your sister and mother would look more elegant and statuesque to promenade the streets with their skirts roiling and *walloping* at every step, like a drunken sailor? Moreover, did it ever occur to your mind, that it must be somewhat inconvenient to be constantly impeded by half a dozen yards of cloth wound about the limbs? Do you not see that women have at least twice the difficulty in walking that men have? A man has nothing to do but go ahead as fast as his feet can carry him. A woman has first to send her clothes forward, and then follow in their wake, as well as she may. Here the hoop interposes. Not only does it itself offer no obstruction to onward motion, but it keeps all other garments at a proper distance, and feminine limbs, free in their impregnable prison-house, can run without weariness, and walk without faintness.

It is very true that hoops are sometimes carried to a ridiculous excess, but this only confirms the suspicion which philosophers have long entertained, that "the race of fools has not yet died out." If a woman choose to make a hogshead of herself, why should you object? You may, indeed, by forcible means, prevent the hogshead; but folly is Proteus, and do not for a moment flatter yourself that she will not turn into a knitting needle. "There is nothing more fulsome than a she fool," said a gallant and courtly nobleman, and it is but a Quixotic crusade (I beg pardon of South Carolina) to undertake a battle against all the wind mills which an ingenious "she-fool," who gives her mind to it will erect. The difficulty is to be obviated, not by breaking up and flinging away the hoops, but by killing off the weak women, who render them contemptible. To such a measure, I heartily subscribe.

In the mean time, tender-hearted men, dear creatures, who bewail so feelingly the sufferings to which women are subjected, I implore you to be consoled. Save your tears to weep for your sins, though I must say, under the rose, that I, all the while, strongly suspect them to be "crocodile tears." Check also your repinings, for I assure you they are of no avail. What if ladies do monopolize the side-walks; there is the broad carriage-way; can't you walk in that? What if you are forced to keep at a respectful distance from your female friends? Do they not know it as well as you? If it were disagreeable to them, would not the whalebones vanish in the twinkling of an eye? Be advised. Comprehend a delicate insinuation, and go your ways, sadder and wiser men.

Another target for the arrows of those astute men who can find no vulnerable point in their own sex, is bonnets. Lives there a single individual of the masculine species, beyond the jurisdiction of pinafores, who has lost his quiver full of them? (arrows, I mean, not pinafores.) Men talk as if there were some great general principle laid down at the creation, like the law of gravitation for planets, to which all bonnets must conform. Therefore, if the latter are not just so large or just so small, they prate of absurdity. Absurdity! The absurdity is in the men, not in the bonnets. If they were twice as large or twice as small as they are now, they would be entirely proper and appropriate. One kind of bonnet is, in the nature of things, no more out of place or in place than another. "How do you like my new hat?" asked a merry girl of her practical, middle-aged cousin. "Well," was the reply, "that is good which fulfils the end for which it is made." I beg leave to inquire what is the real end and aim of a bonnet? To cover the head? By no means. I know that commonplacedom lifts its hands in holy horror, and cries, "St. Paul commanded the women to cover the head." Marry, did he; but did he mean that the whole head should be covered, or only a part of it? If the former, put your head in a bag, and draw the string tightly about the neck. I see no other way to obey his injunctions. If the latter, pray, how came you to know that he meant the top of the head, and not the front? St. Paul, forsooth! Just as if the holy men of old were moved by the Holy Ghost to prescribe the particular fashion of a nineteenth century head-dress!

Is the object of the bonnet to keep the head warm? But woollen comforters wrapped about the ears would far better accomplish that purpose. Is it to protect the face from the sun? Not in the least. Parasols are all sufficient; and are there not shakers and broad-brimmed hats for the sea-side and the mountains? You may as well confess at once. Bonnets are worn, because it is the fashion to wear them. If we were in those parts of Europe where bonnets are discarded in favor of caps, we should discard bonnets, and favor caps. If the mode were to wreath the tresses with a green veil, everywhere green veils would wreath the tresses. If it were to fasten a palm-leaf fan on the top of the comb, everywhere combs would be attached to palm-leaf fans. This is as it should be. When we are in Rome, we should do as the Romans do, unless the Romans sacrifice to idols. The whole tone of thought and feeling which underlies the fashion may be wrong, but the fashion itself, being but the natural product of the soil, is not reprehensible. It would be illogical to say that the Panamanian, in his national costume of a straw hat and a cigar, is ill-dressed, and it would be very logical to educate him so that he shall desire a less simple and primitive garb.

It has been said by excessively modest people, that the present style of bonnets is bold and brazen. I pray to know if the head is a thing to be ashamed of. Women go into crowded and promiscuous assemblies without any bonnets at all, and no whisper of reproach is breathed. If it were the custom to go into the streets in the same way, it would be equally innocent. The whole matter is conventional. She is modestly and well-dressed, who does not attract attention; and when all bonnets are small, a small bonnet does not attract attention.

"The great question with me," said a gentleman, "is, whether women wear bonnets at all. I cannot, for the life of me, find out." My good sir, it is not of the slightest importance, whether you do or not. You may go down to your grave in the same blissful ignorance, and the world will wag on, not a whit the less merrily. Only, if this is the great question which agitates men's minds, Heaven save us from the little ones!

The only objection that has the least semblance of sense is, that the exposure of the head induces tic-doloreux, headache, and a variety of acute diseases, too numerous and too horrible to mention. But the appalling catalogue will be stripped of half its terrors when you reflect that it comes from the doctors—you that are not so simple as to suppose that they would write and speak against any fashion that really did bring them in such a feast of fat things!

By a continuation of the same illogical reasoning, or, rather, the same lack of reasoning, that prevails in respect of the bonnet proper, the cape comes in for a share of the general objurgation. "Don't buy a bonnet," said a young husband, deploringly, to his wife, "which shall just hang on to your comb, and don't let the cape come more than half way down your waist." She assented, like the dutiful wife that she is; but I see no reason why a narrow cape is any more desirable or proper than a broad one—why a cape should not come half the way or all the way down the waist; nay, there are decided reasons why it should, in regard of the protection it gives the neck; so if women should tacitly agree to have capes a yard long, there would be no room for cavil.

My private opinion, summed up in a few words, is, that if men would let bonnets and petticoats alone, and look a little more to the affairs of state, and strive to avert the dangers that threaten their hearths and homes, it would be better for them, and better for the world, and just as well for the petticoats and bonnets.

For the National Era.

LETTER FROM PHILADELPHIA.

September 4, 1856.

There is something particularly pleasant in meeting in the streets of your native city so many familiar faces, and seeing its return to activity. Until within a week or two, the excessive heat drove all who could conveniently leave to the cool mountains or renovating seashore, to the green fields and shadowy woods, or anywhere, where Nature, in the glory of her summer dress and pure, fresh air, were to be found. The hot weather came upon us with particular severity about the middle of July, and we could not reasonably hope for it to be more pleasant until August was over; but we have been delighted the last two weeks with the cool, calm, shadowy days, which seem to have lost their way, and, instead of gracing the Indian Summer, have taken the place of the "dog days."

Railroads and steamboats, with their power of almost annihilating distance, stretch out in every direction, offering their rich inducements for a mere trifle of time and expense. In two or three hours, you may promenade the beach at Cape May, with the breakers of the grand old ocean washing out your footsteps, and the music of its Eternal Anthem in your ear; and more—you may luxuriate in a bath amidst its white caps, and know a delight which nothing else can give. There is, perhaps, not a finer beach, or more ample and safe bathing, in the world, and truly have the Philadelphians learned to appreciate it. Its convenience and particular adaptedness to the constitutions of our citizens seem to make it almost a part of the city; and during the "season," at the hour of promenading, you could readily imagine it was a continuation of Chestnut street. And among the mountains and valleys of Pennsylvania there is a grandeur and romance of scenery which very few, even here, just within a few hours' distance of it, have ever dreamed. Just that one river—the beautiful Susquehanna—is enough to place the State high on the catalogue of "places that must be visited." An artist might spend a summer here with his sketch-book and pencils, and then sigh over the lovely views he must leave untaken; and nowhere could the effect of sunlight be better studied; it plays over the hills, and peeps into the vales, with a softness and beauty I have never seen equalled. But every year our citizens go out more and more, during the summer time, and these little nooks and corners will by and by be found out and enjoyed. It is no more to take a pleasure trip of a thousand miles now, than it was, a few years ago, to go fifty. To the head waters of the Mississippi and back, is a pleasant little jaunt; and even a trip to Europe, in one of our noble steamships, has become quite a common summer excursion.

Our artists, in particular, have become convinced of the importance of a residence for some time abroad, and the advantages of study which it is impossible for them to have at home. Among the latest departures was P. F. Rothermel, and one of his most promising pupils, Dr. J. Wilson; they go to study some two or three years in Florence. T. B. Read returned, some weeks since, after a visit of a few months to his native land. During his stay here, last winter, his studio was much visited, and two pictures, which he had on exhibition, Undine and the Lost Pleiad, talked of. They were painted in Florence, and their praises sounded before they came, though many complain that they are not what the early works of Mr. Read promised. Never will the world be contented with what a man has done, until they are assured he will do nothing more, but look upon every effort only as a foretaste of something better in the future. It is said he takes out orders enough to keep him several years.

Bayard Taylor, that noble and untiring young traveller, has gone again to Europe, taking with him his two sisters and youngest brother; a more enthusiastic young trio he could not well have had. Their delight will be equal to his own, as the first time he visited those hallowed places. He will go with them over much of his earliest trips, visit some of the personal friends he then made, and afterwards go to the North. Norway, Sweden, Russia, and home over the northern part of the American continent. Where, then, will he turn his steps? He will have visited every distant portion of this earth, while he is yet younger than most men commence travelling; and the spirit of it is yet on him as strongly as when a boy. Will he sigh for other worlds to visit? In a letter from Paris, he said, "I never saw England so beautiful. The weather was clear and warm. I saw the loveliest ivy cottages—Anne Hathaway's among the rest—the fairest meadows, the most dazzling poppy fields, the picturesquest elms and oaks; but no trees—not even the venerable oaks of Charlecote, where Shakespeare poached—equal to my own." Beautiful and noble must they be, indeed, to equal those grand old oaks and chestnuts which were his delight, when a schoolboy he read beneath their shade strange stories of far-off lands. One of his greatest desires was to preserve those friends of his childhood from the woodman's axe, and he has done it, by becoming their possessor. So, rejoice, O trees, in your pride and strength! for the hands of Heaven, you have a lease for a long life. He who calls you "my own," would not willingly harm one of your branches. Would I might tell you of the delightful pic-nic he gave to his friends beneath their shade; never was born a more lovely day in the gay month of July, never a happier or merrier party danced on the greensward; and the earnest and heartfelt wishes for a prosperous voyage and safe return will keep bright in the minds of the travellers the memory of absent friends, and assure them of the joyous welcome that will await their return.

To those who will spend the winter on the other side of the great water, we will give our best wishes for their enjoyment, will we gladly welcome back those with whom we will share the duties and pleasures of life in this fair city; and if we miss the pleasant faces and kindly voices of those, we feel there is a season full of labor and joy to be spent with them.

There is so much of interest, so much to be thought and said on the great questions of the day, so much to be studied in art and literature, so much of beauty in the outward world, that we stand surprised at the many paths of pleasure and profit opened to the mind; and although we one hour mourn over the wrongs done in the name of our country—mourn that in her native halls Liberty is but a name, and feel that the dark clouds which have been gathering for years overshadow all the fair landscape—the next we feel it is a glorious thing to live, that there is a duty for each to perform, and that all must be up and at work to the best of his ability. The great crisis is at hand, and all the future history of America will tell in living words the result of the next election.

D. D.

POLITICS IN IOWA.

Le Claire, Iowa, *Sept. 3, 1856.*

To the Editor of the National Era:

As the friends of Mr. Fillmore have commenced the campaign in this district for their candidate, it may be interesting to some of your readers to give some of the features now presented by the leaders of the movement. The most noticeable fact is, the evident understanding and good feeling prevailing between the Buchanan and Fillmore men. The former know that their only chance for this State is by drawing votes from Fremont to Fillmore; hence, while they denounce Colonel Fremont, they are profuse in encomiums on Mr. Fillmore, and speak of him as their second choice, &c. Finding that no existing paper could be prevailed on to advocate the claims of Fillmore in this region, they have started a campaign paper, the *Weekly Union*, about half the size of the *Era*, published at Davenport, without any name of editor, publisher, or printer, attached. The editor, however, is an individual who was, but one month since, Vice President of the Buchanan Club in this place, and stumped this county, during the late contest, on behalf of the "Democratic" ticket. I asked a leading Buchanan man in this place what he thought of the Vice President of their Club going for Fillmore? The reply was, Oh, he is doing as much good for Buchanan now, as he could do anywhere. Of course so.

The *State Democrat*, after noticing very favorably a Fillmore meeting which was held in Rock Island, on the 26th ultimo, and was addressed by I. P. Cook, says: "If Mr. Cook takes the stump in this State, the Fremont party may tremble for their existence." The *Weekly Union* is printed at the office of the *State Democrat*.

On the 29th ultimo, a Fillmore meeting was held in this place. It was called as a mass meeting of the whole county, and it was given out it would be the largest ever held in the county. About 200 persons were present—not more. We consider it helped, rather than retarded, the Republican cause. No doubt it will be told in the East that this State will go for Fillmore, just as it is told here that New York and Connecticut are given up to Fillmore. But if any one is alarmed, let him look at the returns from the First Congressional district in this State, where the Fillmore candidate for Congress was run by his utmost strength, and yet Mr. Curtis received 1,300 majority. In this district, where both Republicans and Know Nothings were united, the majority for Congress is over 5,000. There can be no doubt, but that a large number of those who will vote for Fillmore will vote for Buchanan, in preference to Fremont. This they avow openly. The reason is, they are intensely Pro-Slavery, and vote accordingly. Can there still be Whigs, who persuade themselves that, by voting for Fillmore, they do not vote for Slavery Extension? If so, let them but compare the platforms of all the parties, and they must see their error.

Yours, &c., E. Russell.

FREMONT'S RELIGION.

"Father Olivetti" is one of the witnesses relied upon by Brooks, Ely, & Co., to prove Col. Fremont a Catholic. These lie-machines say that "Father Olivetti" declares that he knows Fremont is a Catholic, and he means to vote for him on that ground. But "Father Olivetti," in a letter dated at Whitehall, proclaims this to be a falsehood. He says:

"*The Albany Statesman* having published a statement, purporting to have been made by me, in which I am understood to say that Col. Fremont was a Catholic, and for that reason he would receive my vote.

"Being a Minister of the Gospel, I appear before the public with reluctance; but my name having been dragged into the political arena against my consent, to give countenance to a misstatement, it is my duty to contradict it. In the first place, the statement of the *Statesman* is false. *I therefore say that I do not know that Col. Fremont is a Catholic.* I never intended to say that I would vote for him. *I never stated that I knew* him was a Catholic. I have heard of no evidence to prove that he was a Catholic; *the fact that he was married by a Catholic Priest, if such was the case, furnishes but little evidence that he was a Catholic. Catholic Clergymen often marry those who are not Catholic.*"

Henry Ward Beecher in a recent letter says:

Lenox, *August 25, 1856.*

Dear Sir: The story of Noble is true; and the record of it you enclosed to me I wrote.

Nothing can be more silly than the attempt to fix upon Col. Fremont the Catholic religion. I am personally acquainted with Col. Fremont and his excellent wife; and have repeatedly talked with him upon this subject, minutely; and I must say that in all my life I never knew a lie, so utterly baseless, and persisted in, after contradiction, with such wilful malice.

But it is plain, that where personalities make up the substance of a campaign argument, there is little else upon which they can afford to make an issue. It is well the great moral principles and the civil doctrines which lie at the foundation of our Government are on the Republican side.

Let the falsehoods and the gross *personal abuse* be left to those who choose to employ them. Should Col. Fremont become our next President, I believe that we shall have taken a long and firm step towards the purity of Washington's Administration.

Very truly, yours, H. W. Beecher.

For the National Era.

THE STRANGER.

"Stript, wounded, beaten, nigh to death,
I found him by the highway side."
Montgomery.

Sisters, with the heart of Martha,
Going forth the Lord to meet,
With the love of blessed Mary,
Pouring oil upon his feet,
Have you heard it? Do you know it?
Lo, our Lord is in the street!

Loving sisters, ye are many;
How your hearts would throb to know,
That along our pleasant city,
Just released from Slavery's woe,
Hungry, thirsting, faint, and needy,
Christ with weary feet doth go.

O, to give our roof for shelter!
O, to share with Him our bread!
Like the blest Judean woman,
Bathe His feet, anoint His head!
But He counteth every kindness,
(We remember He hath said,)
To the least of these his children,
As 'twere done to Him instead.

One of these, His precious members,
Pauseth at your door to-day,
With the brave heart of a mother,
Bearing up the shattered clay;
Black and poor, despised and lowly,
For your pity came to pray;
Humbly suing in her sorrow,
Sure you will not say her, nay;
Thus disguised, it is the Master,
That you lightly send away.

Done to thee, wilt thou esteem it,
O our Saviour, done to thee?
When life's burdens grow too heavy,
This shall our rejoicing be,
Thou hast said it, we believe it,
"Ye have done it unto me."

Providence, September, 1855.

TERRITORY OF KANSAS.

An Act to punish offences against Slave Property.

Sec. 1. Be it enacted by the Governor and Legislative Assembly of the Territory of Kansas, That every person, *bond or free*, who shall be convicted of actually raising a rebellion or insurrection of *slaves*, free negroes, or mulattoes, in this Territory, *shall suffer death.*

Sec. 2. Every free person who shall aid and assist in any rebellion or insurrection of *slaves*, free negroes, or mulattoes, or shall furnish arms, or do any overt act in furtherance of such rebellion or insurrection, *shall suffer death.*

Sec. 3. If any free person shall, by SPEAKING, WRITING, or PRINTING, advise, persuade, or induce any *slaves* to rebel or conspire against any citizen of this Territory, or shall bring into, print, write, publish, or circulate, or cause to be brought into, printed, written, published, or circulated, or shall knowingly aid or assist in the bringing into, printing, writing, publishing, or circulating, in this Territory, any book, paper, magazine, pamphlet, or circular, for the purpose of exciting insurrection on the part of the *slaves*, free negroes, or mulattoes, against the citizens of the Territory, or any part of them, such persons *shall be guilty of felony, and suffer death.*

Sec. 4. If any person shall entice, decoy, or carry away out of this Territory, any *slave* belonging to another, with the intent to deprive the owner thereof of the services of such slave, or with intent to effect or procure the freedom of such slave, he shall be adjudged guilty of grand larceny, and, on conviction thereof, *shall suffer death, or be imprisoned at hard labor for not less than ten years.*

Sec. 5. If any person shall aid or assist in enticing, decoying, or persuading, or carrying away, or sending out of this Territory, any *slave* belonging to another, WITH INTENT TO PROCURE OR EFFECT THE FREEDOM OF SUCH SLAVE, or with intent to deprive the owner thereof of the services of such slave, he shall be adjudged guilty of grand larceny, and, on conviction thereof, *shall suffer death, or be imprisoned at hard labor for not less than ten years.*

Sec. 6. If any person shall entice, decoy, or carry away, out of any State or Territory of the United States, any slave belonging to another, WITH INTENT TO PROCURE OR EFFECT THE FREEDOM OF SUCH SLAVE, or to deprive the owner thereof of the services of such SLAVE, and shall bring such slave into this Territory, he shall be adjudged guilty of grand larceny, in the same manner as if such slave had been enticed, decoyed, or carried away out of this Territory, and in such case the larceny may be charged to have been committed in any county of this Territory, into or through which such SLAVE shall have been brought by such person; and, on conviction thereof, the person offending *shall suffer death, or be imprisoned at hard labor for not less than ten years.*

Sec. 7. If any person shall entice, persuade, or induce any SLAVE to escape from the service of his master or owner in this Territory, or shall aid or assist any SLAVE in escaping from the service of his master or owner, or shall aid, assist, harbor, or conceal any SLAVE who may have escaped from the service of his master or owner, he shall be deemed guilty of felony, AND PUNISHED BY IMPRISONMENT AT HARD LABOR FOR NOT LESS THAN FIVE YEARS.

Sec. 8. If any person in this Territory shall aid or assist, harbor or conceal, any SLAVE who has escaped from the service of his master or owner in another State or Territory, such person shall be punished in like manner as if such slave had escaped from the service of his master or owner in this Territory.

Sec. 9. If any person shall resist any officer while attempting to arrest any SLAVE that may have escaped from the service of his master or owner, or shall rescue such SLAVE when in custody of any officer or other person, or shall entice, persuade, aid, or assist such SLAVE to escape from the custody of any officer or other person who may have such SLAVE in custody, whether such SLAVE has escaped from the service of his master or owner in this Territory or in any other State or Territory, the person so offending SHALL BE GUILTY OF FELONY, AND PUNISHED BY IMPRISONMENT AT HARD LABOR FOR A TERM NOT LESS THAN TWO YEARS.

Sec. 10. If any marshal, sheriff, or constable, or the deputy of any such officer, shall, when required by any person, refuse to aid or assist in the *arrest and capture of any slave* that may have escaped from the service of his master or owner, whether such SLAVE shall have escaped from his master or owner in this Territory, or any other State or Territory, such officer shall be fined in a sum of not less than one hundred nor more than five hundred dollars.

Sec. 11. If any person *print, write, introduce into, publish, or circulate*, or cause to be brought into, *printed, written, published, or circulated, or shall knowingly aid or assist in bringing into, printing, publishing, or circulating*, within this Territory, any book, paper, pamphlet, magazine, handbill, or circular, containing any STATEMENT, ARGUMENT, OPINION, SENTIMENT, DOCTRINE, ADVICE, OR INNUENDO, *calculated* to produce a DISAFFECTION among the SLAVES in this Territory, or to induce such SLAVES to escape from the service of their masters, or resist their authority, HE SHALL BE GUILTY OF FELONY, AND BE PUNISHED BY IMPRISONMENT AT HARD LABOR FOR A TERM NOT LESS THAN FIVE YEARS.

Sec. 12. *If any free person, by speaking or writing, assert or maintain that persons have not the right to hold slaves in this Territory*, or shall introduce into this Territory, *print, publish, write, circulate, or cause to be written, printed, published, or circulated, in this Territory*, any book, paper, magazine, pamphlet, or circular, *containing any denial of the right of such persons to hold slaves in this Territory*, such person shall be deemed *guilty of felony, and punished by imprisonment at hard labor for a term not less than two years.*

Sec. 13. No person who is conscientiously opposed to holding SLAVES, OR WHO DOES NOT ADMIT THE RIGHT TO HOLD SLAVES IN THIS TERRITORY, SHALL SIT AS A JUROR on the trial of any prosecution for the violation of any of the sections of this act.

This act to take effect and be in force from and after the 15th day of September, A. D. 1855.

Signed, J. H. Stringfellow, Speaker of the House; Attest, J. M. Lyle, Clerk. Thomas Johnson, President of the Council; Attest, J. A. Halderman, Clerk.

SPEECH OF HON. RUSSELL SAGE, OF NEW YORK,

On the Professions and Acts of the President of the United States, the Repeal of the Missouri Compromise, the Outrages in Kansas, and the Sectional Influence and Aggressions of the Slave Power.

Delivered in the House of Representatives, August 6, 1856.

Mr. Chairman: When I took my seat here in December, 1853, I found a new Administration in power, having been elected by one of the largest popular votes ever given to any previous one. It had over two-thirds of its friends in the Senate and in this House. It received this power by professions and pledges of adherence to the compromises of the past, and opposition to the agitation of the question of Slavery in the future. The country was in an unprecedented state of prosperity. Our foreign and domestic affairs were of the most pacific character; but in less than two months a change commenced, and instead of peace and quiet reigning, as had been promised, the fire-brand of Slavery and sectionalism was introduced into the Senate of the United States by the Senator from Illinois, [Mr. Douglas;] and the unfortunate bitter and sectional results that have followed it, is the subject which I propose to discuss during the time allotted to me this evening, in the following order, namely:

ITS CAUSES.—ITS OBJECTS.—ITS RESULTS.—ITS INFLUENCE AND REMEDY.

First, its cause was owing to the departure from the professions and pledges made prior to and at the commencement of the present Administration. It is a historical fact, that during the long and exciting session of the Congress of 1850, certain Senators and Representatives, then in Congress, got up a Congressional pledge, for the purpose of forever stopping the agitation of the subject of Slavery and of saving the Union, and that the present Administration came into power on the professions and pledge of adherence to and support of this Congressional pledge and the Compromise Measures of 1850.

Mr. Chairman, in order that we may fully realize the fidelity of this Administration in its professions and pledges, I beg to read this memorable document, that the country may judge of the difference between professions and acts:

Declaration and Pledge.

"The undersigned, members of the Thirty-first Congress of the United States, believing that a renewal of sectional controversy upon the subject of Slavery would be both dangerous to the Union and destructive to its objects, and seeing no mode by which such controversies can be avoided, except by a strict adherence to the settlement thereof, effected by the Compromise passed at the last session of Congress, do hereby declare their intention to maintain the said settlement inviolate, and to resist all attempts to repeal or alter the acts aforesaid, unless by the general consent of the friends of the measure, and to remedy such evils, if any, as time and experience may develop. And for the purpose of making this resolution effective, they further declare that they will not support for the office of President or Vice President, or of Senator or Representative in Congress, or as member of a State Legislature, any man, of whatever party, who is not known to be opposed to the disturbance of the settlement aforesaid, and to the renewal, in any form, of agitation upon the subject of Slavery hereafter.

Henry Clay,	Howell Cobb,
C. S. Morehead,	H. S. Foot,
Robert L. Rose,	William Duer,
William C. Dawson,	James Brooks,
Thomas J. Rusk,	A. H. Stephens,
Jeremiah Clemens,	R. Toombs,
James Cooper,	M. P. Gentry,
Thomas G. Pratt,	H. W. Hilliard,
William M. Gwin,	F. E. McLean,
Samuel A. Eliott,	A. G. Watkins,
David Outlaw,	H. A. Ballard,
C. H. Williams,	T. R. Hammond,
J. Phelps Phoenix,	J. P. Sheppard,
A. H. Schermerhorn,	Edmund Deberry,
John R. Thurman,	H. Marshall,
D. A. Bokee,	Daniel Breck,
George R. Andrews,	James L. Johnson,
W. P. Mangum,	J. B. Thompson,
Jeremiah Morton,	J. M. Anderson,
R. J. Bowie,	John B. Kerr,
E. C. Cabell,	J. P. Caldwell,
Alexander Evans,	Allen F. Owen."

Now, sir, remember the distinguished men who signed it, the phraseology used, and the warning made in it, "*That a renewal of sectional controversy upon the subject of Slavery would be both dangerous to the Union and destructive to its objects;*" and yet, Mr. Chairman, before the short space of four years had elapsed, some of the very men who had signed this celebrated pledge were open and violent in denouncing the North, and urging the passage of the Kansas and Nebraska bill, repealing the Missouri Compromise Act.

But, sir, before I speak more specifically respecting the repeal of this time-honored act, I wish to call attention to the declaration of the President of the United States, as contained in his first annual message to Congress, in December, 1853, in which he says:

"It is no part of my purpose to give prominence to any subject which may properly be regarded as set at rest by the deliberate judgment of the people. But while the present is bright with promise, and the future full of demand and inducement for the exercise of active intelligence, the past can never be without useful lessons of admonition and instruction. If its dangers serve not as beacons, they will evidently fail to fulfil the object of a wise design. When the grave shall have closed over all who are now endeavoring to meet the obligations of duty, the year 1850 will be recurred to as a period filled with anxious apprehension. A successful war had just terminated; peace brought with it a vast augmentation of territory; disturbing questions arose, bearing upon the domestic institutions of one portion of the Confederacy, involving the constitutional rights of the States. But, notwithstanding differences of opinion and sentiment which then existed, in relation to details and specific provisions, the acquiescence of distinguished citizens, whose devotion to the Union can never be doubted, has given renewed vigor to our institutions, and restored a sense of repose and security to the public mind throughout the Confederacy. THAT THIS REPOSE IS TO SUFFER NO SHOCK DURING MY OFFICIAL TERM, IF I HAVE POWER TO AVERT IT, THOSE WHO PLACED ME HERE MAY BE ASSURED. [illegible] THE VOICE OF FREEDOM WILL NOT PRONOUNCE UPON US, SHOULD WE PROVE FAITHLESS TO THIS GREAT TRUST."

Oh! sir, if these patriotic declarations had been adhered to, how much of bitter sectionalism would have been avoided! how many peaceful and happy homes would have been saved!—and how much of human suffering, precious lives would have been saved. But, alas! truth compels me to declare, that it was but a deceptive declaration—a figure of rhetoric.

Now, Mr. Chairman, having shown what the professions of the leading men of the South were, and of the present Administration in particular, I proceed to consider the causes which have led to the present deplorable state of things throughout the length and breadth of the country; and I charge that it is owing to the violation of the declarations and pledges to which I have referred, in the re-opening of the Slavery agitation in 1854, by the repeal of the time-honored compact known as the "Missouri Compromise Act," from which all the present domestic troubles have arisen, and has well-nigh seriously strained the stability of the Union.

In January, 1854, a bill was introduced into the United States Senate, by the Senator from Illinois, [Mr. Douglas,] providing for the organization of

[SEE FOURTH PAGE.]

WASHINGTON, D. C.

THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 18, 1856.

Office, No. 501 Seventh street, between D and E, one square south of City Post Office.

THE ERA FOR THE CAMPAIGN—FURTHER EXTENSION OF TIME.

Price only Fifty Cents.

The *Era* for the campaign, *from the first of September to the first of January*, a period of four months, embracing the most interesting part of the canvass, and the returns of the vote in November, will be furnished to subscribers, *singly or in clubs, at fifty cents a copy.* Will our friends see that the offer be made public in their several neighborhoods, and send us as many names as possible? It is just as important to circulate papers as it is documents.

SECTIONALIZING REPUBLICANISM.

The reader will find elsewhere, in the *Era* of to-day, the proceedings of a Republican Convention, held in Baltimore, with a view to the nomination of a Republican Ticket for the State of Maryland. It will be seen that the Convention was broken up by a mob composed of Buchanan and Fillmore men, and that two leading men of the Convention were rudely and brutally treated. One of them, Mr. Corkran, a member of the Society of Friends, and a most estimable native citizen, was knocked down, and his coat torn off. This is another specimen of the intolerance and ruffianism of Slavery, which we especially call the attention of our Northern friends to, before they go to the polls at the approaching elections. Let them remember, that even in Maryland, in a city which derives full half of its wealth and prosperity from the free North, the negro-driving Buchanan "Democracy," and the Fillmore Know Nothings, will not tolerate the mildest expression of Northern sentiment—the sentiment which is almost universal north of Mason and Dixon's line. Is it not time that this spirit were rebuked—that the party which sustains it in all its outrages were effectually overthrown?

It will be seen that the address which was read on the occasion, in the presence of a large part of the mob, was of the very mildest type of Free-Soilism. It is scarcely up to the standard of Henry Clay; and yet such has been the demoralization of the country under the last four years rule of the sham Democracy, such the effect of the example of protection to ruffianism in Kansas, that the opponents of Slavery extension cannot hold a meeting in Baltimore! Six or eight years ago, meetings were frequently held in that city, for the discussion of Slavery, without the slightest opposition; and in 1848, the Free-Soilers had an electoral ticket in the State. But now, under the auspices of the sham Democracy, it is as much as a man's life is worth to utter publicly an expression of opposition to Slavery extension. This is Progressive Democracy!

The Baltimore papers generally censure the violence. The *American* takes liberal ground on the subject.

Since writing the above, we learn, on reliable authority, that Mr. Corkran was very roughly used by the mob; and that he still suffers from the wounds and bruises he has received. He was robbed of ten or fifteen dollars in money, and a draft on a firm in the city for $193; the latter is no loss, as he has stopped the payment. We understand that an electoral ticket has been agreed upon, which will be published in a few days.

KANSAS.—It will be seen, by reference to the latest news from Kansas, that the Border Ruffians are, for the present, after a series of horrible outrages on individuals, held in check by the Free State party. They have abandoned the idea of attacking Lawrence for the present, and their ruffian rabble has dispersed, without signalizing their courage.

It seems that Mr. Brown, the Free State partisan leader in Kansas, is not dead. He has written a letter to his wife, from Lawrence, giving an account of the battle of Ossawattomie. He states that three Free State men were killed, and not thirty, as reported by the Pro-Slavery party. Only thirty or forty Free State men were engaged in the fight. The Pro-Slavery party admit that they had 250, and yet they suffered more loss than their enemies.

HON. JOHN M. BOTTS, of Virginia, made a speech, a few weeks ago, in Richmond, which has been published at length in the *New York Herald*. It is an able and powerful exposure of the corruption and misrule of the present Administration, and denounces the repeal of the Missouri Compromise as the prolific source of the present troubles in the country. He ridicules the idea of a dissolution of the Union following the election of Fremont. *He thinks that any change from the Democracy will be for the better.* If the Disunionists resort to force, "*he will meet them at Philippi!*" His speech was received with great enthusiasm by the large audience. The *Richmond Enquirer* denounces Mr. Botts as a "Black Republican." It says, "the speech will be published; and that, if Botts is not arrested under the act for the suppression of incendiary language, the law is either a dead letter, or our prosecuting attorneys are not true to their duties."

MAINE ELECTION.—The vote in 323 towns is, Hamlin, Republican, 62,013; Wells, Democrat, 37,701; Patten, Whig, 5,526. From last year, the increase of the Republican vote is 15,227; decrease of Democratic vote, 5,421; decrease of Whig vote, 4,201. The majority for Hamlin is 18,786. Notwithstanding the greatest efforts made, the increase of the vote over that of last year is only 5,765—105,240 now, to 99,535 then. The towns to come in are chiefly in Aroostook county, and will be liable to slightly decrease the majority of Mr. Hamlin. If Aroostook has not elected the Democratic candidate, the Senate will be unanimously Republican, as is the case in Vermont. The six Republican candidates for Congress all have heavy majorities. The largest is that of Mr. F. H. Moore, in the Kennebec and Lincoln district—about seven thousand. Foster, of the sixth district, has the smallest—about one thousand.—*National Intelligencer.*

MILITARY OPERATIONS IN KANSAS.—*Washington, Sept.* 12.—It is understood that both Governor Geary and General Smith have been informed by telegraph that they will be furnished with additional forces, if necessary, to maintain the public peace, and bring to punishment all acts of violence or disorder, by whomsoever perpetrated. Only persons regularly enrolled by General Smith will be allowed to carry on military operations in Kansas.

POLITICAL.—*New York, Sept.* 16.—The *Herald* says that it has received a communication from the North American National Committee, declaring that the letter of Gov. Johnston, declining the nomination for Vice President, was surreptitiously obtained. Also, that the Committee had requested a withdrawal of the letter, and Gov. Johnston wrote a reply, withdrawing his declension for the present.

POLITICAL AFFAIRS.—Hon. Ephraim Marsh, of Schooley's Mountain, who was President of the National American Convention which nominated Fillmore and Donelson, is out for Fremont and Dayton, having addressed a Republican meeting at Morristown, New Jersey, on Wednesday last.

THE POWER OF THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT OVER SLAVERY IN THE STATES.

The reader will find in another part of to-day's issue a communication from William Goodell, Esq., of New York, the well-known advocate of Radical Abolitionism, in which the writer takes exception to some editorial remarks which appeared in the *Era* some weeks since. Mr. Goodell maintains that the Federal Constitution warrants the abolition of Slavery in the States by the Central Government, without the co-operation and against the wishes of the States, respectively, in which the institution exists. He has not told us whether the abolition of Slavery is to be effected by the legislative or the judicial power of the Federal Government; but the inference is legitimate, that the object may be effected in either way. Another writer, whose brief communication on the subject we also give place to, admits that the legislative power cannot touch Slavery in the States, while he insists that the judicial can.

It is worthy of remark, in this connection, that the class of Radical Abolitionists to which Mr. Goodell and Mr. Gerrit Smith belong are the very antipodes, in constitutional theories, of the class of Radicals represented by Messrs. Wm. Loydd Garrison and Wendell Phillips. The latter run into the opposite extreme, of maintaining that the Federal Constitution is thoroughly Pro-Slavery; that Calhoun was its true interpreter—and that the aims, efforts, and successful labors of the propagandists of Slavery are all in accordance with the spirit and letter of the Constitution! Hence, they are disunionists.

The Republicans dissent from both these constructions. They neither believe that the adoption of the Federal Constitution was a declaration of general emancipation, nor do they believe that it was a declaration in favor of upholding and perpetuating Slavery. If the framers of the Constitution had been actuated by either of these objects, they would have said so. If they had intended the immediate abolition of Slavery in the States—as Mr. Goodell must insist, since he maintains that the Judges of the Supreme Court are bound to liberate every slave on the writ of *habeas corpus*—they would have said so. The whole question would have been discussed in the Convention, and the terms on which the slaves were to go free would have been definitely arranged. They agreed, after much discussion, that the slave trade should be discontinued after twenty years. This was a declaration that they were opposed to the further extension of Slavery; but it was also a declaration, equally plain, that they did not contemplate the immediate abolition, through the Central Power, of Slavery; and that they did not intend to confer upon the Supreme Court, or upon Congress, the power to abolish Slavery, immediately or remotely. For if the Supreme Court has the power to liberate the slaves, it instantly becomes the sworn duty of every Judge, on the application of any slave to declare him free. Hence, the adoption of a Constitution conferring that power would amount to an act of immediate abolition. Now, after so sweeping a clause for abolition, to go about a special clause for stopping the supply of slaves from the African Coast, at the end of twenty years, would be in the highest degree absurd.

There are those who contend that the framers of the Constitution designedly "put a negro" into it, but we never before heard it charged that they had inserted a "bull." The greater includes the less. The immediate abolition of Slavery would have rendered nugatory and preposterous the clause for stopping the slave trade at the end of twenty years. The truth is, that South Carolina and Georgia strenuously insisted upon this right of importing slaves from Africa, and made vigorous opposition to its prohibition. The matter was feely discussed, and at length the compromise was agreed upon, by which the slave trade was not to be prohibited until the year eighteen hundred and eight. Virginia was strenuous for prohibition; South Carolina and Georgia were strenuous in its favor. New England was lukewarm, and joined Georgia and South Carolina (for a consideration) in protecting the trade for the time specified. So pointed was the protection given to it for that time, that in providing for amendments to the Constitution, in article five, this clause and one other were specially excepted from the rule laid down—*they* were not to be touched until the year 1808.

Again: The Constitution declares that "Representatives and direct taxes shall be apportioned among the several States which may be included within this Union, according to their respective numbers, which shall be determined by adding to the whole number of free persons, including those bound to service for a term of years, and excluding Indians not taxed, three-fifths of all other persons."

We think that this phraseology embraces every imaginable species of humanity, in the terms free persons, except those whom the State laws designate as slaves; and hence, we think the conclusion is inevitable, that the "all other persons" must refer to slaves. The framers of the Constitution thought so, because they avowed most explicitly that that was their meaning. Mr. Madison "would not admit in the Constitution that there could be property in man;" and, therefore, he agreed to adopt a phraseology which would designate a class which was not free, without pronouncing them slaves. They are not slaves under the Constitution of the United States, but they are slaves in spite of the Constitution.

There can be no doubt that a large majority of the framers of the Constitution, and of the American people whom they represented, were ashamed of Slavery. They endeavored to keep it out of sight, and to ignore its existence as far as possible. But it is equally certain that the exigencies of their situation—the necessity of union to the national independence, and the tenacity of South Carolina and Georgia in behalf of Slavery, and, on some points, of the whole South—constrained the Convention to adopt and the States to accede to certain clauses which were intended to shield Slavery against the power of the Federal Government. The whole spirit of the instrument, and the Declaration of Independence on which it is founded, are against Slavery; and it is for this very reason that the clauses to which we have referred were thought necessary to protect the system against the interference of the Federal Government. The Constitution condemns Slavery, and wherever it has exclusive jurisdiction it retains the right to abolish or exclude it. But within the States, the framers of it were under the necessity of disclaiming the right to interfere. They were compelled, not to sanction, but to admit, with a blush of honest shame, the existence of the fact.

There are certain clauses of the Constitution, quoted by Mr. Goodell, which are inconsistent with, and which seem to favor, his notion of conferring the power to abolish Slavery. For instance, the 4th section of the 4th article declares that "the United States shall guaranty to every State in this Union a republican form of Government." It is insisted that Slavery is inconsistent with Republicanism. We think that true Republicanism is inconsistent with Slavery; but it is evident that the framers of the Constitution, as well as its ratifiers, understood the term in its general and popular acception, derived from the usage of ages. Athens was a republic, and yet Athens held slaves. Holland was a republic, and yet Holland had an aristocracy. The same may be said of Switzerland, at the present day, and of Florence, Genoa, and Venice, in the middle ages. It is therefore trifling with the subject to attempt to base an argument in favor of the right of the Federal Government to abolish Slavery in the States, on this clause of the Constitution. There are other clauses of the Constitution which we admit to be inconsistent with Slavery, and which, viewed apart from those we have already considered, and one or two others, and disjoined from the historical connection in which they stand, would warrant the construction which Mr. Goodell places on them. Of this character is the clause which prohibits the suspension of the writ of *habeas corpus*, unless rebellion or invasion make it necessary; and the guaranty of "life, liberty, and property," against deprivation "without due process of law."

But what are the historical facts connected with these clauses? Mr. Goodell is familiar with them. He will not deny that the three-fifths clause in the first article of the Constitution refers to slaves, and that it was designed to secure the representation of Slavery to that extent.

He will not deny that the "migration or importation" of certain persons from the coast of Africa was to be permitted until the year 1808, as a protection of the existing slave trade; and he will not deny that the exception to the general rule laid down for amending the Constitution, was made with the same view of protecting this trade. He will not deny that the clause relative to fugitives from labor was intended to refer to fugitive slaves. We know that he insists that it may refer to apprentices and indented servants, and that it should not be so construed as to work injustice. But he cannot deny the historical fact, that the framers of the Constitution made it with reference to fugitive slaves.

We might fill columns with extracts from Mr. Madison's Report of the Debates in the Federal Convention, showing that everybody understood slaves to be referred to in these clauses; but we should weary our readers. Mr. Goodell will admit what we say to be true. He may deny that the Constitution, as framed, does shield Slavery from overthrow in the States; but he will not deny that the framers of the Constitution intended to shield it. They contemplated the continued existence of Slavery in the States. They intended to provide for the representation of three-fifths of the slaves in Congress, and for the levy of taxes upon the States in like proportion to three-fifths of their value. They intended to make a compact among the States for "delivering up" fugitive slaves. And they intended to tolerate the African slave trade until the year 1808. We particularly call the attention of Mr. Goodell to the debate in the Federal Convention, on the 21st and 22d August, as reported in the Madison Papers. He will there find, beyond question, that this clause refers to the African slave trade. He will also find that Northern members were more disposed to apologize for or tolerate the trade, than those from Virginia and Maryland. Mr. Ellsworth and Mr. Sherman, of Connecticut, and Mr. Gerry, of Massachusetts, were for leaving the whole matter to the States. Mr. King, of Massachusetts, even, was indifferent to the moral aspects of the question, and only looked upon it from a political point of view. Mr. Mason, of Virginia, on the other hand, spoke, with the honest indignation of a modern philanthropist, of the horrors of the slave trade. And Mr. Martin, of Maryland, was emphatic in its condemnation. It is to be remarked, however, that even Mr. Mason was jealous of State sovereignty, and, like Patrick Henry, insisted upon the strongest guarantees against the interference of the Federal Government with the institution, as it existed in the States.

Mr. Goodell will admit all this—he cannot deny it, if he would. He will admit, furthermore, that the slaveholding States ratified the Constitution with the same understanding of the meaning of these clauses. Their State Conventions sat for weeks, debating the question of adoption or rejection; and gave no little of their time to the subject of Slavery, as it was affected by the Constitution. The object and effect of each of these clauses which we have spoken of as referring to Slavery, was thoroughly scanned; and by the leading men in the Federal Convention themselves, who went home and became members of the State Conventions. There was no misunderstanding, therefore. The Convention and the People understood each other; and they adopted a Constitution founded in the general principles and spirit of Liberty, but tacitly admitting the existence of African Slavery. This was the condition on which the States assented to the Constitution, and became members of the Union. Would it be fair or honorable—would it be acting in good faith—for the possessors of Federal power to ignore the palpable meaning of these clauses of the Constitution and their history? Could they exercise the power of the Government for the overthrow of Slavery, against the wishes of the States, without repudiating the conditions on which the States became members of the Union? Religious bigots have proclaimed the maxim, that no faith is to be kept with heretics. Does Mr. Goodell approve of that maxim?

In our article upon which Mr. Goodell comments, we quoted the clause of the Constitution which asserts "that the powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States, respectively, or to the People." He very illogically infers, from the use we made of this clause, that we insist upon the general right of the States to chattelize its citizens, and rings the changes upon his own unwarrantable construction of our language. What are the facts of the case? Slavery existed in the States before they framed the Constitution; and before they would consent to form a National or Federal Government, they expressly stipulated for the privilege of managing their domestic affairs. They insisted upon their right to hold African slaves under the Constitution, to have them represented in Congress, and to reclaim them if they ran away. And after enumerating all the powers which they intended to confer upon the Federal Government, they stipulated that the powers not granted were to be reserved to the States and the People. Is it not clear that they reserved the power to hold their African slaves? We did not say, and by no means admit, that they reserved a right to enslave free citizens; nor do we doubt that the Federal Government would be bound to interpose, to prevent their enslavement. We go further. We insist that the States which have come into the Union without slaves, have no right to institute Slavery. That condition was not "nominated in the bond;" and being unjust and arbitrary, it is not admissible that it shall grow up as matter of right, under a false idea of State sovereignty. The States are not sovereign, absolutely, but sovereign to certain intents and purposes. They have entered into a Union which was designed "to establish justice, and secure the blessings of Liberty to ourselves and our posterity." Their basis is the Declaration of Independence, which proclaims universal equality; and exceptions to these principles and this spirit cannot be allowed beyond the actual facts, as they existed at the time the State became a member of the Union. On the same grounds, Slavery cannot be carried into the Territories, and cannot constitutionally exist in this District.

The ground of Lord Mansfield's decision in the Somerset case, in 1772, has often been reiterated by the bench of the United States—even by that of more than one Southern State—viz: that Slavery is the creature of positive law; and being against natural right, it can only exist by special enactment, within the jurisdiction, of the legislating power. A slave, according to this long-recognised principle, when carried beyond the limits of the State where the institution has been thus specially established, becomes free. Hence we hold, that under the exclusive jurisdiction of the United States there can be no Slavery; and that all legislation for its maintenance in the Territories, or in the District of Columbia, is in violation of the letter and spirit of the Constitution. We nevertheless think, that as such enactments are made by and in the name of the Government, they impose upon it an obligation of good faith, not to abolish the institution, without fair compensation to the owners of slaves.

While we unqualifiedly insist that the Federal Government is precluded by its own terms from interfering with Slavery in the States, without their consent, we have the clearest conviction at the same time that such interference would be utterly impracticable, and, if attempted, highly injurious, in every point of view. In the first place, the South has an honest conviction, from which there is no dissent, even among the Anti-Slavery men of that section, that Slavery within the States, whether evil or good, is shielded by the Constitution from interference by the Federal Government. Any attempt to touch it by the hand of Federal power must therefore arouse feelings which lie far deeper than the prejudice and passion of the hour, which are the props of Slavery. Every sentiment of patriotism and independence would be aroused by such interference, and in the contest between the State and Federal authorities the Southern people would be reinforced by a consciousness of being in the right, which could never be aroused by a struggle, like the present, for the privilege of extending Slavery. We Americans all agree that the Church Establishment in England, as well as the privileged order in the State, are founded in principles of wrong and inequality; but can we imagine for a moment, that high-minded English Republicans would tolerate the interference of France for their overthrow? And would any high-minded Southron, however opposed to Slavery, acquiesce in such interference with Slavery at the expense of the sovereignty of his State, secured to it by the Constitution?

There cannot be the shadow of a doubt that Emancipation forced upon the South on the plan of the Radical Abolitionists, would be resisted to a bloody issue. Nothing but overwhelming power could accomplish it in peace, and then at the expense of the independence and sovereignty of the States within their own limits. In other words, a consolidated despotism would be the result of acting out the Radical Abolition doctrine—a despotism as well over the whites of the free States as of the slave States. The States would cease to be States—they would become mere counties or provinces, under such a latitudinarian principle of constitutional interpretation as that which ignores all the clauses and their history which relate to Slavery. The same mode of construction, or, rather, the same mode of distortion of the Constitution to the purposes of the ruling party, has led to the doctrine that Slavery goes, as a natural right, wherever the slaveholder chooses to carry it. It is on this principle that the Kane doctrine rests, which overrides the barriers of State sovereignty north of Mason and Dixon's line, and which would enable Senator Toombs to call the roll of his slaves on Bunker Hill.

We hold, therefore, that the State Rights doctrine is not only correct in theory, but best for practical use—best for the slaves, and best for the whites—best for the present, and best for all time. The Federal Government may legitimately use its influence to cultivate the spirit of Liberty in the States; and when not thus used, it is grossly and wickedly perverted from its great object and purpose, as it is at the present time. Now its power and influence are on the side of the foulest spirit of Slavery extension. Now they are employed to uphold the despotic power of the slaveholder—to crush the freedom of the press and of speech. The Republicans propose to reverse the application of Federal influence—to discourage, to frown upon, and to proscribe, the spirit of Slavery, and to uphold the spirit of Freedom. They propose at the same time to prevent the further extension of Slavery into free territory, and to eradicate it from Kansas. There can be no doubt that this policy will be far happier in its effects than any unwarrantable and despotic interference with Slavery in the States; and there is every reason to believe that it will in a few years result in a great revolution of opinion in the South on Slavery. And that is the great thing needed. The hearts and consciences of the Southern people need to be disciplined for the great work of Emancipation. Forced abolition would produce an exterminating war of races, ten times worse than Slavery. How strange that such a policy should be urged by non-combatants. They dream, if they suppose that all the world will act on their peace maxims. G.

THE PROTEST OF A SOUTHERNER.

BALTIMORE, *Sept.* 15, 1856.

To the Editor of the National Era:

On Thursday evening last, we attended the Republican meeting at Temperance Temple, Gay street, and, for the first time, enrolled our name as a member of the Republican Association of Baltimore. Of a family whose home and all worldly interests have been in the South for more than a century and a quarter, and under the impression that this was a free country, in which upright, thinking men might, with impunity, express their convictions of right and wrong, we repaired to the hall with no apprehensions of being disturbed. We had too much confidence in the good sense and decency of Baltimoreans, to suppose for a moment that they could be guilty of perpetrating such an outrage as was witnessed soon after the meeting was called to order.

A crowd of unprincipled men and boys, most of them the very scum and refuse of the community, made their appearance in the hall, and created a terrible uproar and confusion, first by senseless badinage and loud laughter, and afterwards by vociferous yells and unwelcome huzzas. Some of the lights were then extinguished, and after picking the pockets of two or three members of the Association, an attempt was made to throw them down stairs. The President, Mr. F. S. Corkran, a member of the Society of Friends, and a very worthy gentleman, was most grossly insulted and thievishly wronged. He was tripped up several times, and received a number of severe blows on the side of his head. His pocket book, containing a few five dollar bills and other valuable papers, was stolen; and the skirts of his coat were cut completely off, torn into strips, and distributed amongst the mob. A very excellent old gentleman from Dorchester county, whose gray hairs and benign countenance should have commanded the respect of any one but the lowest-bred ruffian, was also assaulted, and one of the robber-villains made an effort to steal his watch, but without success. We cannot but think that an intelligent community will regard the action of the mob as exceedingly mean and disgraceful. Indeed, we have every reason to believe that the better members of society, regardless of party issues and political opinions, do so regard it. We would like to know, Mr. Editor, whether liberty of speech is guarantied to us, or not. Is this a free country, or do we live under a despotic Government? Will the *Era*, as a guardian of national weal, popular right, and public morals, let us have its opinion?

We are happy to learn that the Republican Association of this city is determined in its purpose to bring out an electoral ticket in favor of Fremont and Dayton, and that the cause of Freedom has been strengthened by the demonstrations recently made against it.

SOUTHRON.

THE GAME OF BLUSTER.

There seems to be a concerted effort on the part of the Buchananites to frighten the North into the traces by threats of a dissolution of the Union. This old game of bluster has heretofore done much for the cause of Slavery; but in the present temper of the Northern mind, it only excites contempt and ridicule. The people of the North have thrown off the leading-strings of the doughfaces and the negro aristocracy, and have entered upon a career of independent thought and action in political affairs. The people of the North love the Union for its glorious memories, for its practical advantages, and for the high destinies they mean to shape for it in the future. But they don't mean to be bullied and humbugged out of their higher love for Liberty by the scarecrow of disunion, which is continually thrust before them. They have more than once heretofore been cheated out of their rights and deterred from independent action in this way; but the robust spirit of Liberty now prevalent will not permit them to listen to the craven suggestion, that unless they again bow the knee to Slavery, the Union will be dissolved. They do not intend to dissolve the Union; nor will they be driven from the free and untrammelled exercise of their rights by threats of dissolution from the other side.

The Oligarchy and its Northern minions, like the pampered despots of all ages, are incapable of learning or forgetting. Being accustomed in past years to succeed by bluster and brow-beating, they are incapable of understanding that the same course of conduct will not produce the same results under the present circumstances. All their old tactics are at fault, in the encounter with the invincible power which their own crimes have awakened. They are dumb-founded by the issue of every succeeding conflict; and yet they want the sagacity, the energy, and the courage, to change their stupid tactics, which have no more influence upon the advancing tide of Freedom, than had the command of the proud Canute or the broom of Mrs. Partington upon the waves of the ocean. The people demand Freedom and Justice for Kansas, and the disciples of Pierce and Buchanan, like the Chinese in their military demonstration against the British invaders, attempt to frighten them from their purpose by getting up a terrible clatter of tin pans!

Governor Wise, of Virginia, has become suddenly smitten with the fear of danger to the Union, and joins the chorus of Buchanan, Fillmore, Choate, Benjamin, Toombs, Slidell, and others, in warning and threatening the North what will be the consequence of the triumph of the "Black Republicans." He says, in reference to the election of Fremont:

"His election would bring about the dissolution of the American Confederacy of States inevitably. Why? For the reason that if New York, Pennsylvania, and Ohio, were slaveholding States, and Canada were to assail them with half the violence and 'all uncharitableness' which Black Republicanism is assailing us with, there would be public war in thirty days, by every patriot's time-piece."

We don't see what the election of Fremont has to do with the case supposed. The "Black Republicans" will "assail the South" with a great deal more bitterness, if they are beaten, than if they are successful. The inference of the Governor is therefore a *non sequitur*. But it would be folly to expect reason from those who have deified Slavery.

By the way, we will remark, in reference to Mr. Fillmore, that never did any man receive so many and such severe rebukes from his friends and supporters, as he has for his stupid threat that the Union would be and ought to be dissolved, in the event of the triumph of what he chose to designate as the sectional party. His Southern friends, such as Winter Davis, all the American papers in Baltimore, the Louisville *Journal*, Mr. Bates of Missouri, and nearly every respectable member of the party in the South, scout with scorn and ridicule the idea that the election of Fremont is to produce a dissolution of the Union. They have applied all sorts of rude epithets to those who maintain such a moon-struck idea, such as fool, ass, traitor, &c. They have not, it is true, given these compliments a personal direction towards Mr. Fillmore, but no one can fail to see the application. They are good limners, and there is no necessity for labelling their drawings.

DELAFIELD, WAUKESHA CO., WISCONSIN.

To the Editor of the National Era:

In your paper of August 21 you have an article headed "Impracticables," in which, after quoting the article of the United States Constitution reserving powers to the States, respectively, or to the people, not delegated to the United States, you say, "if this clause is good for anything, it secures to the several States the absolute control of their domestic affairs, *Slavery as well as the rest.*" Granted the correctness of your statement, provided the matter termed domestic do not *per se* conflict with the provisions of the instrument itself. But in the instance specified, (viz: *Slavery,*) is your statement right? I understand the Supreme Court of the United States to have decided, that the Constitution of the United States uniformly acts upon that class of individuals held in bondage, as *persons*, and not as *property*. If this be true, does not the Constitution operate uniformly upon all persons, and does it not shield alike the citizen of New York and the negro of South Carolina? And is not the provision, that no *person* shall be deprived of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law, as much violated by the enslavement of the negro in Georgia, as it would be in the case of the white citizen of New England?—unless, indeed, negro Slavery is *expressly* legitimatized and established by the Constitution itself—a position I have not yet seen assumed, but expect to one of these days.

I agree with you, that the legislative power of the Union cannot reach, as I see, the institution in the States; but may not the arm of our Judiciary strike it down with one blow, as in the case of England, and, I believe, in Massachusetts? In other words, the Constitution being against Slavery, and not founding or sanctioning it, ought not *every person* claimed as *property*, be adjudged as free, and set at liberty, upon the writ of *habeas corpus*, wherever that Constitution obtains as the *first* law of the land, it being a lower *law* of rather *higher* powers than mere State regulations.

I write you this, not with any captious feeling, but out of profound respect for the masterly ability with which you handle important questions, and the quiet truthfulness with which you discuss exciting topics. Doubting the correctness of the proposition, that Slavery can anywhere *legally* exist under the Constitution of the United States, I would for reasons above be glad to see more in the *Era* on the subject.

Yours, truly, S. A. R.

PROGRESS OF THE CAMPAIGN.—Thus far, twenty members of the Thirty-fifth Congress have been elected, in the States of Iowa, Arkansas, Missouri, Vermont, and Maine. Politically, they divide thus:

	Fremont.	Buchanan.	Fillmore.
Missouri	1	4	2
Arkansas	–	2	–
Maine	6	–	–
Iowa	2	–	–
Vermont	3	–	–
	12	6	2

In the present Congress, the Representatives from the above districts stand equally divided. In reference to the Presidency, the above States stand, seventeen electoral votes for Mr. Fremont, and thirteen for Mr. Buchanan.

The Review.

EVELYN MARSTON. By the author of "Emilia Wyndham," &c. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1856. For sale by Franck Taylor, Washington, D. C.

This book forms No. 202 of Harper's Library of Select Novels, and is one of the best of the series recently issued. Mrs. Marsh, years since, made an impression on the reading public by her striking work called "Two Old Men's Tales." Since then, she has been a favorite writer, and in many respects has improved. There is less of wild and stormy passion in her writings, and the moral effect is better directed. By her work on the History of the Huguenots, or the Reformation in France, she has shown that her sympathies have been strongly enlisted on the side of those brave spirits who suffered and fought for liberty of conscience—"not counting their lives dear to them"—to preserve their allegiance to Heaven. The present tale is founded on the fortunes of some of the refugees of this class. Her characters are strongly portrayed. The aim seems to be, to depict the influence of a true appreciation of mental and moral worth, in humbling a proud spirit, and leading to the sacrifice of wealth—a position for poverty and trial as a consequence. Evelyn and Du Chastel both are sketched in clear outline; and as the plot moves on, the development is easy, till, after varied discipline, suitably received, the trial is ended by rewarded honesty, patience, and confidence in God. It is less simple as a story than John Halifax, which we recently noticed, but it shows as practiced a hand, and by many will be better liked, we presume.

THE AMATEUR'S GUIDE, AND FLOWER GARDEN DIRECTORY. Containing every requisite detail for the successful cultivation of the Flower Garden; embracing the classification of the best varieties of Roses and all plants requisite for the garden; with directions for their propagation, and Remedies for the destruction of Insects. To which is added, the Vegetable Garden Manual. By John T. C. Clark, Washington, D. C. Published by Taylor & Maury. 1856.

A *multum in parvo*, as our readers will see by the above title. But, though a small volume, it is carefully prepared, and is well fitted to meet the wants of many who love to cultivate flowers. In a few pages, and by using a tabular form, the author classifies the various kinds, giving the names, the time of bloom, their color and habit, also method of propagation, in case of cuttings. Engravings very clearly illustrate, too, the processes of culture, the modes of grafting, &c. The second part—"The Vegetable Garden Manual"—will be found, to many of our readers, not the least valuable portion of the book. The directions are simple, and the conduct of the garden, after the most approved style of cultivation, is laid down briefly, but as fully as necessary. The book will not of course supply the place of larger works, for those who pursue the subject extensively, but, by the majority of persons, it will no doubt be felt to be just such a work as was wanted.

CONFIDENTIAL CORRESPONDENCE OF THE EMPEROR NAPOLEON AND THE EMPRESS JOSEPHINE. Including Letters from the time of their Marriage until the Death of Josephine; and also several Private Letters from the Emperor to his brother Joseph and other important personages. With numerous Illustrative Notes and Anecdotes. By John S. C. Abbott. New York: Mason & Brothers. 1856. For sale by Taylor & Maury, Washington, D. C.

Napoleon Bonaparte! Everything connected with that name excited deep interest while he lived; and now, when for more than a quarter of a century he has been slumbering with the dead, a spell seems to linger yet around it. We are no man-worshippers, nor can we agree with Mr. Abbott in his undistinguishing admiration of Napoleon's words or acts. It is no doubt too near the period that the events in which he bore so large a part transpired, to have a full, fair judgment. We question not, that the scales may some time hereafter be held with an even hand, and the judgment then will lie between the two extremes. It will not be all approbation nor all condemnation. The point from which he started, the goal he kept in view, the marvellous course he tracked, will be presented; the thousand side-influences that operated, the controlling providence that threw in its checks, and the solemn lessons taught to ambitious man, of responsibility to One higher than he, will be acknowledged, and, in the light of all, posterity will decide for after generations what Napoleon Bonaparte was, what he should have been, and what he failed to be. He has left his mark, broad and deep, on France and Europe. Years will pass, before the results of his rule will be realized. He was gifted with no common sagacity. He loved France because he made her great, and because he was the spring that set in motion and controlled her forces; but human life on the field of battle, and many an outrage on right, ordered with a stern determination that heeded not the neighbor-law, were as nothing to him, to secure success. His greatness ceased, when confined at St. Helena. In the sullen mood of a disappointed man, he engaged in petty quarrels with the English Governor and other officials, as well as with some of his own attendants, who were forced to leave him for his petulance and injustice. Better for him, had he died on the field of Waterloo, than lived to dim the lustre of his former fame. It was God's retribution, because that, raised up as he had been, he too far forgot his mission, and most of all Him to whom he owed all, and whose steward he was, for his wondrous talents and opportunities. And so he died, with a personal character lessening as it reached its last development—a beacon to teach all mankind, that to be truly great, one must be really good. Sir Hudson Lowe's Memoirs has thrown much light on this last period of Napoleon's life. Mr. Abbott, in his enthusiasm, has sought to gild every scene at every stage of the eventful history; and, as one item in the general effort, he has edited these letters. He regards them as uncommon exhibitions of domestic affection, and warm love for kindred and friends. To us, they appear in many respects intensely French. They are interesting, as coming from Bonaparte at such periods, but there is a great deal of stereotype character about many of them. In the little despatches to Josephine, just before, from, or after the field of battle, there gleams out self-aggrandizement—he does not forget himself—and the manner in which the sentences are strung off, is more like that of bulletins than of letters of familiar affection. Though Mr. Abbott appears to think that in the language used he can see the evidences of great tenderness, with scarcely ever an exception, we view the progress of his eventful career as yielding proofs of peculiar warmth of heart. Now, while the letters of Josephine gradually lose the stiffness or stateliness which at first they seem to have caught from him, it seems to us Napoleon's are more wanting in heart, till that event which, by his fiat, for his purposes of ambition, severed them. The letters to Joseph and to others, as developing his policy and a part of his system, are the most interesting in many respects. He treats Joseph, and often tells him, in so many words, that he has placed him on the throne to be an instrument to carry out his designs—rates him soundly for a good, easy man, yielding to his own feelings and judging for himself, and recommends craft and deceptive-dealing, at times, to hoodwink his subjects and other Governments. This is the plain English of the letters to Joseph, as King of Naples and Spain. We confess, to our view, they do not add to our high estimate of Napoleon's character. Mr. Abbott, not content with giving the letters and adding an occasional note or explanation, appears again a fulsome apologist; quotes himself from other works, and repeats, in the course of a few pages, almost the identical sentences two or three times over; makes continued allusions to Louis Napoleon, the present Emperor, as if his mind was running too on what he might think of the work. The volume could have been put in one-third or half of the size—many things left out—and the reader left to gather the impression for himself the letters should make on him; but there is the same labored effort to make what is bad appear good, and the good as superlatively so, that runs through his former volumes. The volume, as part of the chronicles of Napoleon, should be read, but remembering always there is another side.

RETRIBUTION. A Tale of Passion. By Emma D. E. N. Southworth. Philadelphia: T. B. Peterson. For sale by Taylor & Maury, Washington, D. C.

Mrs. Southworth's writings indicate genius, great powers of invention, and a graphic ability; but she deals too much, we think, in the passionate. She lets her pen go out in untamed exuberance of language; and though all this may suit present effect, and produce excited interest in many readers, it is injurious to the moral power and permanent influence of her works. The cast of story, likewise, in her several volumes, have too great resemblance—they are, for the most part, dark pictures in the dark passages of human life. It is on this account we do not place these tales of passion, aiming though they do at presenting the illustration of certain phases of human character, and dealing out its reward, so highly as many others of the works of fiction issuing from the press. Were their gifted author to select some better development of character, treat it more calmly, chasten down her language, and abandon the impulse of desire for present effect in the higher aim of usefulness in the longer period, we are confident a richer product of salutary influence would be the result, with, we believe too, in the end, the reflection that her pen had wrought better in the cause of human welfare. The present volume has the characteristics of the others—their excellences and their defects. It appeared first in the *Era* in 1848, we think—produced a wide-spread sensation—and introduced her as a novelist, most favorably, to the literary world. We regard Mrs. Southworth's "India" (the story published in this journal) as one of the best of her efforts, wrought up with equal effect to any, with less of their defects. Shannondale, too, belongs to the same class. All of her volumes contain vigorous sketches of character—deeply-traced records of wrong. She ever comes forth on the side of right against injustice. She might throw more at times of the religious in gleams of light across her dark foreground, and so relieve the mind receding from the horrors of one scene, after another of fell passion. Here she greatly fails, as compared with Mrs. Stowe, whom she would do well to study, and gain if she can the wondrous secret of her power, by which, employing her own varied talent, she might fasten in the minds of her readers a stronger hold on their best sympathies. The volume is printed neatly, and does justice to the press of its publishers.

From the Baltimore Clipper.

THE REPUBLICAN MEETING AT TEMPERANCE TEMPLE.

In accordance with public notice, the Baltimore Republican Association met last night at Temperance Temple, Gay street. When we entered the room, at the hour for which the meeting was called, there were but few persons present. The number, however, gradually increased, and, before the meeting was called to order, we saw a number of prominent Democrats enter the door. Shortly after, a motley crowd blocked up the doorway, but were perfectly quiet.

The meeting organized, on motion of Mr. William Gunnison, by calling Mr. F. S. Corkran to the chair, in the absence of the President, and the appointment of W. E. Cole, jr., as Secretary, in the absence of Mr. Jacob Fussell, the regular Secretary.

The minutes of the preceding meeting were then read and adopted; after which, Mr. Wm. Gunnison read the following address, which we give as part of the history of the proceedings, for the information of our readers:

AN ADDRESS TO THE REPUBLICANS OF MARYLAND.

The Republicans of Maryland, in submitting an Electoral Ticket to the people, submit with it a declaration of their principles.

They declare true-hearted, entire devotion to the Constitution of the United States; and now that the subject of Slavery, which was the greatest objection to the union of the States under our Government, has been made the entering wedge to split it asunder, we declare our adhesion especially to the Compromises made in the Constitution, and which, in the acquisition of new Territories, were made in conformity to it, to settle the difficulties growing out of the question between the North and the South, which cemented the Union, and gave peace and prosperity to the country.

We declare our abhorrence of the repeal of the Missouri Compromise of 1820 and that of 1850, as a breach of faith and a violation of the compact between slaveholders and non-slaveholders, and the cause of civil war, now for the first time broached in our country; and proclaim it as our solemn conviction, that there never can again be unity between the two classes of our citizens, or peace between the two great sections of our country, until the rights guarantied by all the Compromises in regard to Slavery are fully restored.

We declare the charge, that the Republican party is in favor of the Abolition of Slavery, to be utterly unfounded. As a party, throughout the North as well as at the South, they hold that this is a subject only to be disposed of by the Government of the slave States—(and we, as citizens of a slave State, pronounce the opinion, that the liberation of the blacks would be an unmixed and unmitigated evil, fatal to the African race, which would be crushed under the weight of the superior race, and, for a time, degrading and every way mischievous to the laboring classes among the latter, and calculated to unsettle the political as well as the economical elements of our Government.) We believe that Slavery never can and never should be abolished without making just compensation for the capital sunk, whether it was capital invested in the purchase or rearing of the slaves.

We believe that even with the consent of those interested, and just compensation made, the State Legislatures could not safely make a sudden emancipation, nor without provision, made through the agency of the General Government, for the removal of the manumitted race to some region, as our continent between the tropics, suited to the African race, and where it is found the white race can never flourish. Nature has put her interdict upon the amalgamation of the races; natural repugnance forbids it, and it is found that the hybrid race, whether of whites and blacks, or between whites and Indians, always become abortive after several generations.

In every aspect in which Slavery among us can be considered, it is pregnant with difficulty. Its continuance in the States in which it has taken root has resulted in the monopoly of the soil, to a great extent, in the hands of the slaveholders, and the entire control of all departments of the State Government; and yet a majority of people in the slave States are not slave-owners. This produces an anomaly in the principle of our free institutions which threatens in time to bring into subjugation to slave-owners the great body of the free white population; and yet to get rid of Slavery as an institution instantly, would prove ruinous to all classes, and must therefore be looked upon as impossible, and, if to be accomplished in time, can only be in a remote future, and therefore not to be thought of in connection with impending dangers. To meet them, we must recur to the wisdom and patriotism of our fathers, which so happily averted all the mischief apprehended from this threatening element in our institutions, until the recent legislation of Congress overturned their work. They provided that the unsettled Territories into which Slavery has not entered shall be reserved for free labor.

This was the compromise which the slaveholders themselves proposed at the foundation of the Government—which was followed up by them in the Missouri Compromise and that of 1850, and this left to the 350,000 slaveholders within the boundaries, one-third more Territory than is comprised within the free States, which contain at this time a population of less than 20 millions. Add to this 4 millions of non-slaveholders in the South, and we have 24 millions of people who look to the unsettled Territories for homes for themselves or for their posterity. Shall the 350,000 slaveholders, who have within the slave States a third more land than there is in the non-slaveholding States, be permitted to carry an institution into these Territories, which will enable them to monopolize the soil in those Territories, as they have already done in the slave States? The fact is clearly established, even by our brief experience, that even where a small proportion of slaveholding, with slaves not numbering more than a tenth of the inhabitants, get footing in a Territory, that the whole is sooner or later appropriated by them, and the power of the Government, with ownership of soil, fall into their hands.

The question now to be settled is: Shall the Territories reserved by the Compromises for free labor be encroached upon by Slavery, and the free white man, of whatever class, who would fly from the institution, have no spot in the temperate regions of the national domain in which he can be secure?

The Homestead Bill proposed by Mr. Grow, of Pennsylvania, (one of the distinguished Republicans of that State,) proposes "to grant to every actual settler on the public domain a homestead of 160 acres, on condition of occupancy and cultivation for the period of five years." This free gift to actual settlers would fill the region reserved by the compromises for free labor with owners of small freeholds from the North and South, in the course of a very few years.

The Government would receive an annual revenue, as much greater than that derived from the old States, as the soil of the new lands is superior to that of the old States.

The promptitude with which the settlement would be made under this system would make returns to Government in the shape of revenue which would much more than indemnify it in money for the loss of that which might have been derived from the dilatory sales of the lands, to say nothing of that return in the vast immigration of freemen it would invite, which, as a body of free, brave, toiling yeomanry, constitutes the best wealth of the nation.

For the rights once secured by the Compromises, for the 25,000,000 of our countrymen, of the South as well as the North, who have no share in the political and pecuniary advantages conferred on a class of 350,000 slave-owners, the Republican party of the United States organize their strength to contend. Their candidate, Col. Fremont, has, in his letter accepting the nomination to the Presidency, declared in favor of the principle of the compacts, which, excluding Slavery, reserved the Territories for free labor, and in favor of the proposed legislation which would make every settler a *freeholder*. Mr. Buchanan, the candidate of the party misnamed the Democratic, has declared himself against the restoration of the principle of the Compromise which established the Union, and which pacified the contentions of the country in 1820 and 1850.

He declares himself in favor of the measures which have destroyed the peace of the nation, and has solemnly pledged himself to the policy of the Administration, which, in failing to secure Kansas to slaveholders by the fraud of the Nebraska-Kansas act, employs the military force of the nation, and calls out the *militia* of the States, to establish the usurpation imposed on the Territory by Atchison's invasion from Missouri, and to sustain the despotic laws which have defeated the organic laws of Congress inviting emigrants from all sections, and which are designed to drive out the white laborer, and give the Territory to Slavery.

The Republicans of Maryland declare opposition to the policy of the Administration, which, beginning with a violation of a most solemn treaty among the States, in reference to Slavery, ends by making war upon those citizens who would avail themselves of the rights conferred by the organic act which repealed the Compromises. They declare opposition to the candidate set up by the party of the Administration to carry out its measures; but they also declare it to be their fixed purpose to rely on the constitutional remedy for mal-administration. They would use ballots, not bullets and bayonets.

They confidently rely on the suffrages of the people, to place in power a Chief Magistrate and a Congressional representation that will give effect to public opinion, redress the wrongs that have been perpetrated by agents false to the will of their constituents, and restore peace and good feeling to a nation, which nothing but a sense of intolerable wrong could provoke to assume the hostile attitude which brings distress to the bosom of every lover of free institutions.

The reading of the address was listened to very quietly, and there was no symptom of disturbance or any interruption whatsoever. Just, however, as Mr. Gunnison had finished reading the address, a comical-looking individual with a long beard rose and walked towards the door, which, with the staircase, were now packed with a dense crowd, mostly of young men. His approach towards them was greeted by an obstreperous laugh. He made some gestures with his hands, and apparently addressed some words to them, which only had the effect to increase their laughter.

This was a signal for a general uproar; cheers for Buchanan were mingled with groans for Fremont. There was also cheering for Fillmore. Hisses and cries of all kinds made it impossible to be heard. Groans were given for Mr. Gunnison and for Mr. Fussell, and for the Black Republicans. Amid this pandemonium, the President requested all who wished peace and quietness to take their places on the other side of the chair. A number did so, when the question was put on the adoption of the address, and carried by the votes of those near the chair. A motion was then put, and carried, to adjourn, the crowd at the door being too much occupied in making a noise to notice what was going on.

The noise now became greater than ever. There were cries to *put out the lights*, and *hustle the covies out*. *Most of the Republicans managed to slip away unperceived*, but on Mr. Corkran's endeavoring to leave the room, he was assaulted, and very roughly handled. He succeeded in reaching the street, when his Quaker hat was knocked off by some of the mob, and trampled upon; his coat was torn from his back, and he was knocked down. He succeeded in gaining his feet, and ran into a door way near by, which was open, when it was shut in his face. He was then pursued by a mob of several hundred persons to Baltimore street, and along Baltimore to Holliday street, where he found refuge in a house from the fury of his pursuers, whose yells, when they discovered their prey had escaped them, were terrific.

It was reported that Mr. Gunnison was also assaulted and beaten by the mob. The mob, which seemed for the most part to be composed of hangers-on of the Sag Nicht meeting at Rechabite Hall, then repaired to the office of the *Wecker*, the German Fremont paper, in Frederick street, which they assailed with stones, and evinced their intention of sacking it. The firm interference of the watch and police prevented the completion of their designs, and thus ended the first Republican meeting in Baltimore.

From the Baltimore Sun.

REPUBLICAN ASSOCIATION OF BALTIMORE.

This Association held a meeting last evening at the Temperance Temple, and in the absence of the President, Mr. Elias Hawley, on motion of Mr. Wm. Gunnison, Mr. F. S. Corkran was called to the chair, and Mr. Wm. F. Coale, jun., was selected as Secretary *pro tem.*

Mr. W. Gunnison, from a committee appointed to report an address to the Republicans of this State, submitted one, which set out with the declaration of their devotion to the Constitution and the Union, and of their adhesion to Free-Soilism in Territories admitted; declaring the repeal of the Missouri Compromise to be a breach of faith on the part of the South, and that peace and unity could not again exist without the same was restored.

It also declared that the charge made against them, of being in favor of Abolitionism, was unjust and unfounded, as they held the opinion that the emancipation of the slave would tend to render his condition worse, and fatal to the black race, unless the Government should take steps to colonize the manumitted slaves.

declares Slavery to be pregnant with difficulty, by causing a monopoly of the soil in the slave States, and that it tended to subjugate the rights and interests of the non-slaveholder to the slave-owner. The Kansas act it denounces as a fraud, and also denounces the Administration, for employing the Government troops in the civil war existing in that Territory, as the address sets forth, against the Free State men.

At this stage of the reading of the address, a large number of persons, who had assembled in the room and around the door, created some slight confusion by crowding and laughter, when a Mr. Meredith, well known as a Sunday street-preacher, passed down the room to them, and commanded silence, and ordered them to leave the room, or take seats. This was succeeded by loud laughter, applause, and hisses; and three cheers being proposed for Fillmore, they were given, amidst the utmost confusion and terrific noise, produced by stamping, clapping of hands, &c. Next, three cheers were given for Buchanan in the same fashion, and for some twenty minutes there was kept up a succession of cheering for these gentlemen, alternated with loud groans for Col. Fremont, Corkran, Gunnison, Fussell, and others taking part in the meeting, the whole being interspersed with cries of "Turn off the lights," "Tar and feather them," &c., while loud calls were made by the same parties for speeches from those concerned in the meeting. Some of the lights here being turned off, these gentlemen commenced leaving the room, when they were saluted as they passed through the crowd with groans, hisses, and other similar sounds and remarks, they making as hasty an exit as possible, followed by the crowd, where an immense concourse had assembled; and upon reaching the street, loud cries were made for rails, upon which to ride them, and the cheering and groaning was renewed. Messrs. Corkran and Col. Wm. E. Coale were followed by the crowd, and roughly hustled about, until they had reached the corner of Gay and Fayette streets, where the former was tripped up, or knocked down, and the tails of his coat cut entirely off, while the latter-named gentleman, although not so roughly treated, was pushed and hustled about in other than a pleasant manner, and his hat mashed in. They were then allowed to take their departure, while the crowd amused themselves by cutting the portion of Mr. Corkran's garment they had secured, into strips, and distributing it among them.

Those taking part in the meeting numbered from thirty to forty persons, while the outside crowd amounted to at least two thousand persons; in fact, the whole street, from the hall to Fayette street, was almost entirely blocked up.

From those concerned in the meeting, we learn the Association had determined upon presenting an electoral ticket in this State, and that the names of those selected was to have been announced at this meeting.

FROM KANSAS.

The Fight at Ossawatomie—Full Particulars—Statement of Prisoners Captured by the Pro-Slavery Men—Mob Murders at Leavenworth—Two Thousand Free State Men Under Arms at Lawrence.

From St. Louis papers of September 5 and 6.

THE MURDER OF MR. PHILLIPS.

We have just seen and conversed with Mr. J. L. Abernethy, of Rushville, recently a resident of Leavenworth, Kansas, who left that place on Tuesday last, the 2d inst., who brings not only the latest, but the most exciting intelligence, we have yet received from that scene of disorder and lawlessness. He says, that on Monday last the city election was held in Leavenworth. The Free State men, fearing a collision and violence, withdrew their ticket, and took no part in the election. The Buchanan party appointed fifty men to guard the polls, and exclude all "Abolitionists." There was much rioting and disturbance during the whole time. One Free State man, unaware of the withdrawal of the ticket, went to the polls, and was shot at four times by the Buchanan men, but escaped without injury.

Soon after this affair, sixty-five of the Ruffians marched to the house of Mr. Phillips, the gentleman who was lynched some time ago for defending McRea, against whom the Ruffians have always retained a bitter enmity, and demanded the arms he had in the house, and that he should surrender himself a prisoner. He refused, and they at once began firing on the house, in which there were no men but Mr. Phillips and his brother. Mrs. Myers, a daughter of Mr. Freyberger, of Connersville, in this State, was in the house at the time, and says that the bullets hailed all through the house. She passed through here this morning on her way to her father's. After firing awhile, the Ruffians broke into the house. As they were mounting the stairs, Phillips shot two of them with his revolver, and was immediately riddled with bullets. Two balls entered his eyes, and four charges of buck-shot were driven right through his breast. His brother was wounded in the arm, and on Tuesday, when Mr. Abernethy left, was thought to be dying.

The Ruffians, after completing the murder of Phillips, tried to fire the town, but were dissuaded by some of the more moderate of their party. All the Free State men who could be seen on the streets were then taken prisoners. Captain Emory, the same who took Mr. Houghton of this city prisoner, as we related the other day, then had a proclamation read on the corners of the streets, warning all Free State men to leave the place by Tuesday morning, as all found after that would be shot. Mr. Abernethy and about seventy-five Free State, and moderate Pro Slavery men, who refused to take arms or approve of the acts of the Ruffians, left the place at once, on the Martha Jewett. They were taken to Weston, where a part were kept, and the rest ordered to return. Mr. Abernethy was of the portion who returned. They came back part of the way to Leavenworth on Monday evening, and reached the place on Tuesday morning. Then they were immediately ordered away again, and he started on his journey to this State.

The younger Mr. Phillips is since dead.

STATEMENT OF PRISONERS WHO WERE CAPTURED BY THE PRO-SLAVERY PARTY.

From the St Louis Democrat.

A party of some five or six Illinoisians and Indianians, who had gone out to Kansas to settle, returned to this city yesterday morning, on the steamer Polar Star, having been captured at the battle of Ossawatomie, by the forces under General Reid, and after being detained a day or two in captivity, were conducted to Westport, and there placed on board the steamer, to be taken out of the State of Missouri, and accompanied with the threat, that if they ever ventured back to the Territory of Kansas, and were caught, they should instantly be hung or shot.

Learning of the arrival of this party, we had an interview with its men on board the steamer Baltimore, on which they had taken passage for Alton, Illinois. Their several accounts agree so perfectly, that we have condensed and embodied all their statements, that we might present our readers with a complete and reliable narrative of the terrible conflict at Ossawatomie.

The town of Ossawatomie was composed of from thirty to forty houses, and was a thriving place before the Kansas difficulties, and had a population of about two hundred. It is situated immediately between the forks of a branch of the Osage river and the Pottawatomie river. The distracted state of the country had occasioned an almost total desertion of the town by the families living in it, and at the time of the fight it was occupied by about fifty armed Free State men, and a few women and children.

At six o'clock on last Saturday morning, just after sunrise, a Pro-Slavery party of about 400 men, under General Reid, made their appearance before the town, having in their command a piece of artillery, and most of them mounted. They had made a forced march of thirty or forty miles from their camp on Bull creek. As soon as the Free State men descried the Pro-Slavery force, they put themselves under command of Captains Brown and Updegraff, formerly of Ohio, and sought shelter in a growth of underbrush, about 300 yards distant from the town. The Pro-Slavery force maintained their ground at about a half-mile, and commenced firing with their cannon, which was loaded with grape and canister shot and slugs. They had an advantageous position, and each discharge of the gun raked the ambush of the Free State force with fearful effect. One of our informants states that he saw three of his comrades fall at once; still they returned as brisk a fire as they could, and succeeded in wounding several of their enemies. After some ten or a dozen discharges from the artillery, a company of about eighty of the Pro-Slavery force dismounted from their horses, and having surrounded the place of retreat, made a charge, and completed the entire rout of the Free State men, several of whom, in attempting to cross the stream along which the fight raged, were shot in the water, and were either instantly killed, or so badly wounded as not to be able to save themselves from death by drowning.

One of our informants states that he saw the body of Captain Brown in the water. He knew it was him, by his coat and hat. Seven of the Free State men were captured, after which the town was set on fire and entirely destroyed.

In marching back to the camp on Bull creek, the prisoners were subjected to very cruel treatment, and two of them, the one named Williams, and the other "Dutch Charley," were taken out of the camp and shot by their infuriated enemies. The latter was a Hungarian who had fought under Kossuth, and since his removal to this country had lived in Kansas, and taken a very active part with the Free State party. He was present at the battle of Black Jack, and after the capture of the Pro-Slavery party was appointed to guard the prisoners, one of whom was a man named Coleman. This Coleman was at the battle of Ossawatomie, and after the capture of the Free State men, recognised "Dutch Charley." He demanded that "Dutch Charley" be delivered up to him, and taking him out, shot him dead.

Frederick Brown, a son of Captain Brown, was also killed. He was one of the picket guards of the Free State camp at Ossawatomie, and being surprised, he was shot through the heart by a preacher named Martin White. After being killed, and while lying on the ground, with the mouth relaxed and open in death, another shot was fired down his throat.

The above is the straight-forward tale of this party of men, and bears upon its face the impress of truth.

LATER PARTICULARS FROM LEAVENWORTH.

The steamer Emma, which arrived here yesterday with later news than that by the Polar Star, brought down quite a number of the citizens of Leavenworth, who had been compelled to give up their homes and fly for their lives. We heard several of the names of these persons, but do not feel at liberty to publish them. There is no doubt, however, of the fact of their having been driven from their homes, and we hope some of the gentlemen who are now in the city may be induced to give the public a full and explicit statement of the condition of things at Leavenworth City, over their own signatures, so that there may be no mistake or possibility of error. It is time that the truth, and the whole truth, should be known by our citizens. We learn that the mob under Emery have full possession of Leavenworth, and have put every man of the Free State party, and many who are but moderate Pro-Slavery men, to the test, as follows: "Will you take up arms and fight the d——d Abolitionists, or will you quit the Territory?" The alternatives are terrible, and a majority have adopted the latter, some of whom are now in this city, having brought away their families and left all their possessions behind, without the least security in the world that they will be preserved.

PRO-SLAVERY OFFICIAL ACCOUNT OF THE BATTLE OF OSSAWATOMIE.

From the Glasgow Times, September 4.

Messrs. Rice, Patterson, and S. Q. Cary, reached this place last night, direct from the seat of war, and brought us the following highly important news, which we stop the press to lay before our readers:

CAMP, BULL CREEK, *Sept.* 1, 1856.

FRIEND GREEN: We write to inform our friends that we have had an engagement with the enemy, in which we were completely victorious.

Evening before last, (August 30,) 250 men were despatched to Ossawatomie, about 30 miles from this place, the headquarters of the notorious Capt. Brown. We made a forced march, travelling all night, and reached the place about an hour after sunrise. We had one six-pounder. The enemy commenced firing on us at half a mile, which is point blank range for Sharp's rifles. They had taken cover under a thick growth of underwood, and numbered about 150. We charged upon them, having to march 800 yards across an open prairie, against an unseen foe, through a hail storm of rifle bullets. This was done with a coolness and ability unsurpassed, until we got within 50 yards of them, when we commenced a galling fire, which, together with some telling rounds of grape from our cannon, soon drove them from their hiding-place, with a loss of some 20 or 30 men killed.

We lost not a single man, and had only five or six wounded. I had with me fifty of our men, all of whom were in the hotest of the engagement, and distinguished themselves, they being about one-third of all who were in the fight, so that we routed them from their covert, man to man. We had three men wounded—one badly, and two slightly. We burned their town, and returned to camp last night about 10 o'clock.

Notwithstanding this brilliant success, we found it impossible to march upon Lawrence, for want of men and munitions of war, and have fallen back upon Cedar Creek, to wait for reinforcements. Will Missouri forever slumber? If this expedition fails, we have nothing to hope for! Is it possible we are to endure hardships and fatigues for nothing, and our friends not make a common cause with us? We ought to have 5,000 men, to drive these cut-throats from this Territory. Already we have slumbered until the last Pro-Slavery man who came here with the promise of protection has been murdered or driven away, his house burned, and even his children stripped of their clothing. Every section presents awful pictures of murder and ruined settlements. Those who have done all this are now at Lawrence, about 1,500 strong, and, should we leave here, this country is turned over irretrievably to a gang of murderers, whose thirst for blood and plunder will soon carry them to our own homes.

Let our friends come by boat to Kansas city, and from thence to Lawrence is only about forty-five miles, which can be travelled on foot in two days. We want foot soldiers; we have already too many horses. Send on men *immediately*, OR NEVER. Ship cannon with them.

CONGRAVE JACKSON.
G. M. B. MAUGHAS,
Captain Company B.

CEDAR CREEK, *Sept.* 1, 1856.

GENTLEMEN: We want infantry—men who will serve on foot; let there be one two-horse wagon for each squad of ten men; the horses from the counties below can be sent by land; the men and wagons can come by steamboat. Let what can be done, be done quickly.

Yours, truly, D. R. ATCHISON.
CONGRAVE JACKSON.
G. M. B. MAUGHAS.

Messrs. Patterson and Cary.

THE PRO-SLAVERY OUTRAGE AT LEAVENWORTH.

The St. Louis *Democrat* publishes the statements of several leading merchants and citizens of Leavenworth, who were among those driven out by the mob. We copy one of the cases, as follows:

"The undersigned has been a practicing physician in Weston, Platte county, (Mo.,) from the spring of 1839 to the last of April, 1854. From that time to the 2d of September, 1856, I have resided in Leavenworth city, Kansas Territory, engaged in the latter place (viz: Leavenworth city) in the business of druggist and practicing physician, and am one of the thirty-two original proprietors of Leavenworth, with the exception of four or five who resided at Fort Leavenworth. The Leavenworth association was composed of those of us who had long resided in Weston and vicinity; and, feeling a lively interest in the unparalleled growth and future prosperity of the place as one of the original proprietors, and owning a large number of lots that must be exceedingly valuable if Kansas should be made a free State, and believing that the advantages for education, internal improvements, and increase in value of real estate, were greatly in favor of a free State, I expressed my preference that it should be made such, and unfortunately, perhaps, had voted for the Topeka Constitution and with the Free State party, but had refrained from taking any active part in politics generally, and had endeavored to pursue a strictly conservative course. On Monday night, I was called upon by Fred. Emory, at the head of an armed company. He asked if I was a law and order man. I replied, 'I am, sir.' He next inquired, in case of invasion, if I would take up arms in favor of the Pro-Slavery party. I replied, that he knew I was lame in consequence of a fractured leg, but that I would do anything in my power consistently to protect the town. He replied, 'That is right; that is sufficient. You can go to bed and sleep quietly.' But the next morning he again called on me, at the head of an armed body of men, and, in the most peremptory manner, informed me that I must leave forthwith. I told him that I had a large stock of goods, and asked if I could have time to pack them. He told me that I must hasten down immediately to the boat then lying at the levee, (steamer Emma,) and said it was then waiting, and would soon be off. I immediately passed into the house through my store, and requested my wife to prepare in a hurry to take the steamer then at the levee. We gathered up in the confusion and haste a few clothes for the family, I locked the store door, and passed to the back door, which I locked, and with my family of four children, including a very sick babe and two other sick children and feeble wife, hastened upon the boat, leaving a stock of drugs and medicines costing me over $4,000, besides all my family library, beds, and bedding, household furniture, &c. I left the store key with a friend I met with on the boat before I left. There were persons in the company engaged in driving me off owing me borrowed money and on account. About thirty persons were driven upon the same boat in a similar manner.

"S. NORTON, M. D."

LATER FROM KANSAS.

Chicago, Sept. 12.—One hundred Free State refugees arrived at St. Louis yesterday, destitute. They state that a large number of families had taken refuge at Fort Leavenworth. It is reported that a large number of Free State women and children were killed at Stranger's Creek, on Wednesday, 3d inst.

Private advices from Kansas city state that reinforcements are being raised under Gen. Lane, who are about to attack Westport, Kansas city, and Independence. It is stated also that the Free State men surrounded Richardson's force, north of Lawrence, and cut off all retreat and reinforcement.

Gov. Geary arrived at Leavenworth on Tuesday, had a consultation with General Smith, and would proceed to Lawrence in a few day.

Chicago, Sept. 13.—The St. Louis *Democrat* of yesterday announces that General Richardson was taken prisoner by the Free State men, north of Lawrence, and was carried before General Lane, who restored his arms, and sent him back under an escort. Great consternation was exhibited at Leavenworth, in consequence of the rumors of an attack by Lane. General Smith had sent out companies to protect the town. Lane, meanwhile, was still at Lawrence, with no intention of leaving his position.

From the St. Louis Democrat, September 11.

The latest we have from the Territory are the following items furnished the *Jefferson City Inquirer* by the officers of the steamer Genoa:

A party of 150 of Lane's men, under command of a man by the name of Stowell, entered Tecumseh on Thursday, the 4th, and completely sacked the town of all the provisions and clothing it contained. When our informant left, they were still at work, plundering the town.

On Tuesday, the 2d, McKinney's whole train was captured by a party headed by the notorious Brown, in person, who was not killed at Ossawattomie, as before reported.

Judge Lecompte, who is not now at the fort, had issued an order to the marshal of the Territory to arrest Lane and other agitators.

General Smith has likewise issued orders to Colonel Cook, commanding fourteen companies at Fort Riley, to give every assistance and aid to the marshal in the execution of this writ.

On Tuesday, the Keystone arrived at Glasgow, with Governor Geary on board, who was received with a salute from cannon on shore. The gun was afterwards taken on board, in charge of a company of 100 men, armed for Kansas, from Glasgow.

Governor Shannon had a short interview with Governor Geary, on board the Keystone, while lying alongside.

Lane was growing very bold and insulting, and had facetiously sent word to the people of Westport and Independence, that in a few days he would be "down, and take breakfast with them."

Leavenworth was desolate—her stores closed, dwelling-houses deserted, and business entirely suspended.

There were rumors in the city, last evening, that a Government dispatch had passed through, on its way to Washington, conveying intelligence of a fight between the Government troops, under Smith, and Lane's forces; but we could learn nothing reliable, and have no confidence in its truthfulness.

From the St. Louis News.

There is a lull in the Kansas war, which is probably the forerunner of a peace. The army of Missourians recently rendezvoused near Westport, for the invasion of the Territory, is disbanded. Much the larger portion of the men composing it have returned home, leaving a small force of two or three hundred men, under General Reid, to protect the Territory. The cause of the break-up was this: After the affair at Ossawattomie, the men under Reid called out to be led against Lawrence right off, that they might terminate the war by the capture of that place. The leaders, conscious of the impossibility of succeeding in such a hazardous enterprise with such an undisciplined force, refused to march on Lawrence, and fell back on their base of operations on the Missouri border. The men became disheartened, and refused to submit to the severe drilling system which was instituted in the camp, and which experience has demonstrated to be absolutely essential to enable the Pro-Slavery army to make headway against the thoroughly-organized and disciplined forces under Lane. They therefore packed up, and returned home.

LATEST FROM KANSAS—RELIABLE PARTICULARS.

Mr. H. S. Honnold, one of the men who had charge of the Santa Fe (McKinney's) train, captured by the Free State men, called on us this morning, and related the particulars of that occurrence, and other events in Kansas. The train was captured on the 1st, by a party of men under Capt. Cutter—not Brown, erroneously stated. It consisted of three mules, three horses, and sixty-six head of cattle. The baggage of the teamsters were searched, and their arms and ammunition taken from them.

While in charge of their captors they were well treated, no cruelty or indignity, other than the searching of their carpet-sacks, being offered them. On being released, they were given one of the wagons and six oxen, to convey themselves to Missouri with. Word was sent also to the owners of the train, that they could have their property by coming after it, and that it should be preserved for them. Two other trains, Bent's and Campbell's, which it was feared would be captured also, were allowed to pass unmolested by the Yankees, who gave as their reason for capturing McKinney's train, that McKinney was an active Pro-Slavery man, engaged with the Pro-Slavery army.

The "Yankees" told the captives that they had under arms 1,800 men—900 at Lawrence, 500 between Lawrence and Leavenworth, and 400 between Lawrence and the Pro-Slavery camp at Bull Creek. These forces are all under the regular military discipline, no man being allowed to leave the army of his own accord, as in the case with the Pro-Slavery army. They told them also that they had no idea of attacking the Missouri towns. They seemed to be accurately posted in regard to the position, aims, and movements, of the Pro-Slavery forces, as all they told the teamsters was found by the latter to be correct, on their arrival at the Pro-Slavery camp.

When our informant left the Bull Creek camp, on the 4th, the greater part of the Missourians were leaving, too, and not one more than fifty men were left. The determination, however, was expressed, to return on the 13th, and attack Lawrence.

LATER FROM KANSAS.

Chicago, Sept. 15.—Kansas dates of the 10th state that the Free State prisoners had been released on bail.

Gov. Geary had issued a proclamation commanding all armed bands to be dispersed.

Col. Emory's band had been taken before Gen. Smith, for arresting an officer of the army.

Capt. Whipple's company had captured a party of thieves, and recovered eighty horses.

A fort, capable of holding 1,000 men, has been finished at Lawrence.

A jubilee was held at Lawrence on the 10th, to celebrate the release of the Free State men.

GONE OVER TO FREMONT.—*Boston, September* 13.—Hon. Samuel H. Walley, the Whig candidate for Governor last year, has written a letter reviewing political affairs, and declaring for Fremont.

LETTER FROM WILLIAM GOODELL.

To the Editor of the National Era:

In the *Era* for August 21, I find an editorial headed "*Impracticables*," under which term you include those who decline voting with the Republican party, as you yourself for a time, if I mistake not, hesitated to do. A part of your article is devoted to those Abolitionists who, believing, with yourself, that the National Government has no constitutional power to "establish justice, provide for the common defence, and secure the blessings of liberty" for this nation, have concluded to become so "impracticable," as to decline wearying themselves with such hopeful experiments. *This* class I shall leave to speak for themselves.

But another part of your article is devoted to Radical Abolitionists, who, believing that the National Government is, by the Constitution, invested with that power, which they believe to be a salutary and necessary one, decline co-operating with a party, and voting for candidates, who not only decline wielding that power of the nation for the national deliverance, but are "inflexibly opposed" to its being done by others. On behalf of this class, I propose, with your leave, to make some defence in your columns. I need not defend them from the charge of folly in not voting with the Republicans, so long as their views of the constitutional duties of the National Government shall continue to be what they now are. *You* have preferred no *such* charge against them. Nor could you consistently do so, with your *own* views of the vital and fundamentally important distinction and opposition between the two theories. You have accordingly labored to show that the principles of the Radical Abolitionists are fatally subversive of Freedom. I, on my part, and on their behalf, propose to show that the reverse of this is the truth, and that the principles of the "Republican" party, as expounded by you, are fatal to Freedom.

Your main argument goes far back of the Constitution, and so shall mine. But, as you have cited the Constitution in one of its provisions, I shall first examine the argument you have drawn from it.

You quote the Constitution as saying, "The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States, respectively, or to the people."

And this is your proof that the *Government* of the United States has no power to protect *the* people of the United States from chattelhood, and that the "States or the people"—the one or the other, or both of them—have reserved to themselves the right of chattelizing one another—of reducing the citizens of the several States and of the United States to chattels personal! Begging your pardon, my dear Dr. Bailey, the clause proves no such thing, and that for two excellent reasons:

First: The clause cited does not specify nor enumerate "the powers delegated to the United States by the Constitution," nor "the powers prohibited by it to the States." Nor does it say that the power to protect the personal liberties of the *people* of the United States is not committed to the *Government* of the United States, ordained and established by them for that end. Nor does it say that the power of overthrowing the liberties of the people of the States and of the nation (or of any portion of them) is *not* "prohibited by the Constitution to the States."

So that the clause, *of itself*, proves nothing at all to the point for which it is quoted. Before it can be used for any such purpose, resort must be had to the other provisions of the instrument. It must be ascertained that no sufficient powers for protecting the personal liberties of the citizens of the United States *are* "delegated to the United States by the Constitution." It must also be ascertained that the powers essential to the existence of Slavery in the States, and which must be exercised in order to its continuance, are *not* powers prohibited by the Constitution to the States. But the very *reverse* of this is ascertained.

To the Government of the United States IS delegated the power to "establish justice, provide for the common defence, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty" to "the people of the United States" and their "posterity," without exception. The *habeas corpus*, the "due process of law," the right of the people "to be secure in their persons," &c., are specified in the Constitution for this very end. And, lest the State Governments should stand in the way of this, "The United States *shall guaranty* to every State in this Union a republican form of government," as above defined. And "No State shall pass any bill of attainder, or *ex post facto* law, or laws impairing the obligation of contracts, or grant any title of nobility"—four specifications, in one sentence, of "powers prohibited by the Constitution to the States," each of which powers is continually and necessarily exercised in the maintaining of Slavery. But,

Second: The "powers" mentioned in the clause as "reserved to the States, respectively, or to the people," must mean powers which "the States, respectively, or the people," *possessed* before the Constitution was formed. It cannot mean "powers" which they never did or could possess. But the "States, respectively," never had any "power" of enslaving their citizens. Their own declaration of the "inalienable right" of "all men" to "liberty," is an explicit denial and repudiation of any such "power," either in the "States, respectively," or in the "people." Having no such powers to exercise or to delegate, they had such powers to "*reserve*." And they did not "reserve" any such powers, any more than they "reserved" the powers (now exercised by South Carolina and Missouri) of invading a peaceful Territory, supplanting the inhabitants at the ballot-box, enacting despotic statutes for them, and driving them out by the sword. The doctrine that the "reserved powers" of the States include whatever "powers" *the States choose to claim and exercise*, is developing itself in Kansas by its fruits. Suppose it should be claimed, under this clause, that the "States, respectively," or the "people," have "reserved" the "power" of murdering or maiming one-sixth part, or as many as they please, of the citizens of the United States, or of burning its arsenals and navy yards, or the power to banish any or all of their citizens who should vote the Republican ticket, (outrages *not* as distinctly "prohibited to the States" by the Constitution, as is the greater outrage of enslavement,) would this clause of the Constitution shelter them? And has the nation, and its Government, and its citizens, no remedy or redress? If not, then put down the power of caning Northern Senators by the "State sovereignty" oligarchs, among the "powers reserved to the States, respectively, or to the people!" Very manifestly, it is not among "the powers delegated to the United States by the Constitution," and it might be more difficult than in the case of enslaving Americans (by bills of attainder, &c.,) to show that the power of caning Senators was "prohibited by the Constitution to the States."

And this brings me to the main scope of your argument, which goes back of the written Constitution entirely, and plants itself upon the very nature of things—the nature of civil government, and the necessary securities of Freedom. Hitherto, for the most part, the argument against Radical Abolitionists has turned upon the question of *facts*. What does the Constitution *say*? What does it *mean*? What provisions for the security of personal liberty does it *contain*? What powers for the administration of those provisions does it *confer* upon the Government for which it provides?

But the controversy, it seems, is beginning to run back of the question of *facts*. The opponents of radical views seem not satisfied with their successes upon *that* field. They are appealing to *first principles*. In order to fortify their argument as to what the Constitution actually *is*, they are beginning to tell what it *ought* to be, and what the exigencies of Freedom require. Most heartily do I welcome them upon that ground.

In a number of private letters, (one of them from a prominent Republican statesman,) my attention has been called to that class of objections against the national power of securing personal liberty. You, sir, in your *National Era* of 21st of August, are among the first to state publicly and distinctly, and to spread out fully, this new ground of argument—new, at least, among the opponents of the slave system.

In this article you oppose, *upon principle*, the suppression of American *Slavery* by the American *Government*—the security of national *Freedom* by the national *power*—the protection from chattelhood of the American citizen by the Constitution of his country, which is the "the supreme law of the land." The alleged feature of our institutions, supposed to forbid this, which the friends of impartial Liberty have so generally deplored as a defect, a calamity, you have declared to be no defect at all, and no calamity, but an excellent and wise arrangement, without which Liberty itself would be insecure. You say—

"The hypothesis which sets up a claim of jurisdiction in the Federal Government, either in its legislative or judicial capacity, to interfere with Slavery in the States, whether to abolish, modify, or uphold the system, leads to the wildest latitudinarianism, and, if acted on, it would abolish every vestige of State independence and State sovereignty. The abolition of Slavery, even, would be dearly purchased at the price of our system of Confederated Government." * * * "The Federal principle is as essential to the maintenance of Liberty as the *habeas corpus* and the jury trial." * * *

Again, in your comments upon the clause of the Constitution before cited, you say—

"Now, if this clause is good for anything, it secures to the several States the absolute control of their domestic affairs, Slavery as well as the rest, and to trample on it, in the name of Freedom, is to set an example to tyrants fatal to Freedom itself. To depart from it is to establish a system of consolidation, which, in this immense country, would be more inconsistent with individual freedom than that which makes all France subject to the tyrant who has possession of Paris."

Well, sir, this is open, bold, frank, manly, consistent. It is, moreover, a philosophical and correct delineation of the "hypothesis" for which you, in common with the Republican party, contend. You have reached the bottom with your sounding line. This is the legitimate result, the inevitable sequence, of that entire school of constitutional exposition, that theory of a Federative Government and State Rights, which denies to the National Government the power of suppressing all the slavery that exists in the nation; in other words, (for this is the whole of it,) the power of protecting all its citizens or subjects from enslavement; for every permanent inhabitant is a citizen, in the sense of owing allegiance, and of having a consequent right to protection, for allegiance and protection are correlatives, and must go together. Every citizen of a *State* is also a citizen of the *United* States, owes *its* Government allegiance, and has a claim upon its protection.

Now, look, my dear sir, at your own statement of your own doctrine, and consider whether you do yourself believe it. You doubtless *think* you do. But are you quite *certain* that you do? Just look at it. See what it includes.

1. There can be no "vestige of State independence and State sovereignty," without the right to enslave the citizens of the State and of the United States! *Do you believe that? Can* you believe it? From whence was the right derived? What are the evidences of its existence? Have I erred in using the word "right," instead of "power?" Assuredly you could not have been contending for a State "power" which is not a State "right?" In *that* case, you could not have contended for such a *power*, as essential to the security of Liberty.

And how does it appear that "State independence" and "State sovereignty" require, for their existence or security, the right or the power of enslaving the People of the State? What *is* the State? What can it be, but the People of whom the State is composed? Take away the People, or make chattels personal of them, and what becomes of "the State?" Or what can be meant by the phrases "State independence" and "State sovereignty," when the People who compose the State, (if there be any,) so far from having any "independence," or "sovereignty," have no rights, no volition, no self-direction at all? Or does "State independence" and "State sovereignty" mean only the "independence" and the "sovereignty" of the slaveholders? This, we know, *is* the Southern meaning of the phrases. But the *National Era* cannot have adopted those definitions! Or, if it had, the *Era* could not maintain that *such* "independence" and "sovereignty" were essential to the security of Liberty!

2. But look further. The "State independence" and "State sovereignty" that cannot exist without the power of enslaving the citizens, is so priceless and precious, that it *ought not* to be given up, even to secure the abolition of Slavery! In other words, it would not be so bad to have Slavery continued, as it would be to have the States deprived of that "independence" and "sovereignty," which include the power of human enslavement! This seems perplexing. If *that* power be so precious and important, it is not easy to see why Slavery should be abolished at all. "Powers" are of no value that are never to be exercised. And if Slavery should be so abolished as to put it out of the "power" of the States to re-establish it, then the "independence" and "sovereignty" of the States would be left without any foundation. So that Governor McDuffie had some good reason for saying that "Slavery is the corner stone of our Republican edifice!" It *must* be so, I think, if "State sovereignty" and "independence" include the power to maintain Slavery.

3. And it is implied, in all this, that the power to establish and maintain Slavery is, to say the least, as sacred as the power to secure Freedom. The "power" "to abolish, modify, or uphold," the system, rests upon the same basis, unless, indeed, the "power" to uphold be more necessary than the power to abolish. For,

4. You say that the "Federal principle," described by you, is "as essential to the maintenance of Liberty as the *habeas corpus* and the jury trial"—that is, the "power" of the States to maintain Slavery is thus essential to the maintenance of Liberty! Or thus, the doctrine that *denies* the power of the States to establish and maintain Slavery, is a doctrine that denies, by implication, the power of the States to maintain Freedom! And this is but another expression of the common notion that the right to Liberty is derived from the will of the reigning sovereign Government, and exists only during its good pleasure. "That is property," said Henry Clay, "which the law makes property," and he was speaking of property in human beings. Mr. Clay was right, if it be any derogation of "State sovereignty and State independence" to deny its power to chattelize human beings.

5. Thus much in respect to *State* powers. When you come to speak of *National* powers, and the National Government, another feature of Government presents itself. If the Federal Government should protect its citizens from chattel Slavery, which the independent sovereign States have "power" to inflict upon them, the Federal Government would usurp unwarrantable "power," despotic power, "unlimited power," as it is sometimes called—a power subversive of State independence, and therefore fatal to Freedom! This distinction between *State* powers and *National* powers of Government arises, I suppose, from the notion that the *State* Governments are the original, independent, sovereign Governments, and that the *National* Government, not being derived from "the people of the United States," (as is affirmed in the Constitution,) is derived only from the *States*, and is a *subordinate* Government, in the hands of the kind of "State sovereignty and independence" which embraces the power of enslaving human beings, *just as is now witnessed!*

Gather up, now, into one view, the sum total of this "hypothesis" of the State and National Governments, and what have we? It amounts, in one word, to just this: (1.) The State Governments, in virtue of their original, underived "independence" and "sovereignty," have full and plenary "power" to enslave every man, woman, and child, of us—that is, if we remain in the *States*. (The Republican party is laboring to establish the principle, that in the *Territories*, where there is, as yet, no "State independence and sovereignty," the case may be different!) (2.) The National Government, being a derived and limited Government, depending upon the "*States*," (not the "people,") who ordained and established it, has no power to protect a single man, woman, or child, of us, from chattel enslavement, unless we escape into the Territories! (3.) According to this "hypothesis," the "sovereign independent States" may undermine the National Government by the simple process of depriving it of its citizens. They may chattelize the whole of them, except perhaps the slaveholders, who, in fact, constitute the *States*. If a State may enslave some of its citizens, it may enslave all of them. If one State may do this, all the States may do it; and we become a nation of "chattels personal," without any power in the nation or the National Government, by your own showing, to prevent it!

And this, as you tell us in your closing paragraph, is your doctrine of "*Freedom National, and Slavery Sectional!*" This is your "Republican" motto. To my understanding, it can result only in "Slavery National, and Freedom nowhere." The "hypothesis," in the hands of its authors, expounders, and administrators, hitherto, is rapidly reaching its culmination. Is the catastrophe to be averted by a "Republican" party adopting (except for the Territories) the very same thing? What a huge blunder you made, when you charged upon the Northern as well as the Southern extremists, the theory that "*Slavery is National!*" As Radical Abolitionists, *we stand alone* in proclaiming that "Freedom is National" in *all* parts of the nation, and that Slavery shall be sectional nowhere. Yours, truly,

WILLIAM GOODELL.

New York, September 4, 1856.

To the Editor of the National Era:

I perceive that you offer to send a copy of the *Era* for the next four months for every fifty cents forwarded you. The present most perilous position of our country seems to call for the united, cordial efforts of our citizens, however lofty or lowly their several positions, to save all that we hold most precious from the threatened ruin. Especially ought Christians now to labor and to make sacrifices, as well as to *pray* that the Almighty, in his sovereign mercy, may avert the terrible consequences of our great national sin, OPPRESSION! It is, indeed, a righteous retribution, that the oppressor, if he do not repent, be himself oppressed—crushed in the very dust. The Lord grant that this be not our fearful doom! I am, you know, but a poor preacher of the Gospel, and yet I feel that I must do something for my beloved country, in this her hour of sorest need. On the last Sabbath, a congregation gave me five dollars for filling their pulpit. This I now enclose to you, with the request that you will please send ten copies of the campaign *Era* to as many readers. Such a document will, I doubt not, be one of the best means of opening the eyes of our people to the imbecility and wickedness in "high places" that have already brought such miserable evils upon us, and will, unless successfully resisted, speedily involve all we hold dear—civil and religious—in one common ruin. A MINISTER OF CHRIST.

LATER FROM CALIFORNIA.

The Vigilance Committee Retired — Political Movements, &c.

New York, Sept. 14.—The steamer George Law arrived this evening, bringing mails from San Francisco to the 20th of August.

California Affairs.—The Vigilance Committee have unconditionally released Judge Terry.

On the 18th, the Committee had a grand review and parade—the whole force numbering from 4,000 to 5,000 well-appointed troops. The Committee has not been officially disbanded, but it is understood that its functions ceased for the present with the demonstration of the 18th. The different companies retain their arms and organization, and it is reported that the Committee would re-assemble in case of necessity.

A People's Nominating Committee had been appointed for San Francisco, which, it is expected, will have much influence at the approaching election.

The Republicans held a State Convention at Sacramento on the 27th, and nominated Presidential electors, members of Congress, &c.

Murders and robberies are very numerous in the interior. On the 12th inst., near Camptonville, a stage on its way to Marysville, full of passengers, and $100,000 of gold dust, was attacked by six mounted robbers. The passengers defended themselves bravely, and forty shots were exchanged. The coach was riddled, and one woman was killed. Several of the robbers were wounded, and obliged to retreat without their booty.

The total export of treasure from San Francisco during the last seven months has been $30,000,000.

FIVE DAYS LATER FROM EUROPE.

Political News unimportant—Cotton firm—Breadstuffs a shade easier.

Halifax, Sept. 13.—The Royal mail steamship Arabia, Captain Stone, arrived here, *en route* for Boston, at 4 o'clock this morning, with 114 passengers. She left Liverpool on Thursday, the 4th instant, at 11 30 A. M., and has thus made the run in a little more than 8½ days, notwithstanding a detention of several hours off the port on account of a fog.

England.—There is no news of interest from England.

The London *Star* says: "It need not any longer be concealed that the Governments of France and England—that is to say, Louis Naleon and Lord Palmerston, are not on good terms with respect to Spanish affairs; and communications are understood to have passed between them, of anything but a complimentary character.

"We may as well state, that an opinion has found its way to the other side of the Atlantic, that England is ready to make every concession in order to obtain the friendship of the United States, and that this determination has been come to in the event of a possible rupture with France.

"This improved tone of the London journals is interpreted in this sense. We have hitherto hesitated to say so, because these matters of great importance should not be paraded merely for the sake of raising public excitement; but as the Paris correspondents of our own press now begin to talk so much about the matter, reserve must be put aside, and the public should be informed, that while there may be in reality no danger, it is always a serious thing to have our foreign policy under the direction of a Premier like Palmerston.

"A contemporary announces that the Central American difficulty is solved satisfactorily by a convention between Honduras and Great Britain."

[The London *Star* is a poor authority for any statement.—EDS.]

France.—The condition of the health of the Emperor is much discussed. That the Emperor has some malady of a dangerous character may be inferred, but its exact nature is concealed from the public.

Spain.—The Spanish Government has not yet published its decrees dissolving the Cortes, and fixing a new election, or any exposition of its policy. This still remains a subject of discussion. At the latest dates, Lisbon was tranquil, but circumstances had occurred to show that the late riot was essentially political in its sources.

Italy.—In Italy, discontent is spreading. Alarm is manifested in Naples, in consequence of the now-ascertained movement of the Muratist party. This party has been circulating a programme or proclamation at Naples, with secrecy and activity.

Belgium.—The Free Trade Congress Committee, at Brussels, continued to receive the adhesion of influential politicians in England and other countries. Nearly every chamber of commerce had appointed one or more of its members to attend. The provisional commission for organizing the Congress consisted of five of the most eminent political economists, and they were active in arranging for every detail. It was designed to keep the meeting as free as possible from all exterior influences, in the shape of schools or parties, and the appeal was chiefly made to practical men to come forward, and enable the Congress to reach a practical result. The committee had agreed upon a plan of organization by which the sittings and discussions were to be regulated, and the deliberations would be conducted more in the shape of a committee of inquiry than platform effect.

Liverpool Provision Market.—The provision market had undergone no change of moment since the sailing of the Cambria. Lard had further advanced, a sale of 30 tons having been made at 78*s*.

Liverpool Produce Market.—In articles of produce, generally, there has been no change whatever. One hundred barrels of pot ashes sold at 39*s*. @ 39*s*. 6*d*. Pearls quoted at 46*s*. 6*d*. @ 47*s*. Linseed oil, 39*s*. There were buyers of common rosin at 4*s*. 6*d*., but holders were asking 4*s*. 7*d*. Spirits of turpentine quiet, at 33*s*. Freights dull.

THE LATEST.

London, Wednesday Night.—The campaign projected by the Russians against the Circassians is indefinitely postponed.

The *Times* has another leader on Mr. Marcy's proposals respecting merchant ships in time of war.

The *Post* estimates the cost of the war with Russia at £80,000,000 sterling, and recommends that an annual sum be applied to converting personal annuities into terminable ones.

The *Times* Paris correspondent states, from Aix les Bains, in Savoy, that a Congress was to be held there, of partisans of Prince Lucien Murat, to deliberate on the best means of insuring his pretensions to the throne of Naples. It was, however, considered doubtful. The Prince arrived at Aix some days ago, accompanied by some of the most influential of the Muratists, but it is not supposed that France will support his pretensions.

The Paris *Pays* says it is positively stated that the ports of Reni, Ismail, and Killa, on the Danube, restored to Moldavia by the treaty of Paris, are to be declared free ports.

Latest accounts from Stockholm mention several cases of cholera, but the disease appeared in its mildest form.

THREE DAYS LATER FROM EUROPE.

Halifax, Sept. 12.—The steamer Cambria arrived here this afternoon, with Liverpool dates to the 30th.

The steamer Atlantic arrived out on the 28th.

The Arabia had been docked. She had sustained but slight injury.

England.—The conservatives were arranging for their internal differences, with a view of making a grand attempt to overthrow Lord Palmerston's administration.

The Queen of Oude remains at Southampton, unrecognised by Queen Victoria. The royal family had gone to Scotland.

France.—The political news was unimportant. The Emperor intends making a prolonged stay at Braintz.

Another prosecution of the members of the secret society was progressing at Dijon.

The Berlin papers authoritatively contradict the recent statements relative to the proposed Orleans manifesto.

An earthquake occurred at Algeria on the 21st, and several villages were destroyed.

Spain.—The Madrid papers say that decrees were about to appear, dissolving the Cortes, regulating the press, remodelling the Canial of State, and re-establishing the Constitution of 1848.

Two hundred prisoners had been embarked at Barcelona, for Cuba.

Sixteen civil Governors of Provinces had been dismissed, and their successors appointed, half from the Progresista and half from the Moderado parties.

Authentic advices say that the Ministry continues perfectly united, and the Queen places every confidence in them.

The difficulty between Spain and Mexico was definitely settled.

Belgium.—The free-trade Congress excites considerable attention in England.

Prussia.—Grand manœuvres among the Prussian troops were going on at St. Goar, on the Rhine. The reported erection of a line of fortresses around Berlin is confirmed.

Italy.—The Austrian journals repeat the denial of any increase of the Austrian forces in Italy, but admit that the troops already there fully reach the war strength.

The Milan *Gazette* denies that Cicemachio was shot by the Austrians, asserting that he was drowned in attempting to cross the river Po.

The reported disaffection in the Neapolitan army is confirmed. It was commenced by certain regiments having been ordered to work on the railway.

A Frankfort letter professes to give the analysis of a letter from the King of Naples to the Western Powers. The King considers the interference of the Western Powers an encroachment on his independence. He does not refuse the suggested reforms, but considers the Neapolitan Government the best judge of the matter. He does not say, as was reported, that he will repel force by force, but hints that if the real cause of grievance exists on the part of the Western Powers, he is open to a European Congress.

Turkey.—The Porte is taking measures for the chastisement of the Montenegrins, for their recent fanatical outrages. The Porte has also given renewed assurance to the Western Powers, that the concessions to the Christians will be observed.

There is a talk of a tax on tobacco, to realize two hundred millions piastres.

Russia.—It was rumored that an expedition of Russians against the Alasinians was designed, but the rumor was discredited. Not a single Russian soldier had crossed to Ingour.

India.—Telegraphic advices from Calcutta to the 17th, and from Bombay to the 20th of July, had been received. The heir to the Burman throne had been assassinated.

The Indigo crop in Bengal has been injured. The import trade was dull.

China.—The dates from Hong Kong are to the 10th of July, and from Shanghai to the 28th of June. Exchanges were firm. The insurrection was progressing. The Canton tea market opened at 29 taels. The crop of new silk was large.

Breadstuffs.—The prevalence of stormy weather had caused breadstuffs generally to advance. Flour has advanced 1*s*., wheat 2*d*., and corn 1*s*. 6*d*.—the improvement being chiefly in the better and inferior grades. The market generally closed dull, and prices irregular. On Friday, the weather became favorable for agricultural purposes, and prices consequently closed weak, with but small transactions. Richardson, Spence, & Co., quote Western Canal flour at 26*s*. @ 29*s*.; Southern 30*s*. @ 33*s*.; good Ohio 35*s*. @ 37*s*. Wheat has advanced 2*d*. Red 7*s*. @ 9*s*. 9*d*. White 9*s*. 6*d*. @ 11*s*. Corn has advanced 1*s*. @ 1*s*. 6*d*. White 34*s*. @ 35*s*. Mixed and yellow 34*s*.

Dr. Parker, the United States commissioner, had gone northward on a diplomatic mission.

Mr. Harris, the American consul at Simoda, had left Hong Kong for Japan, in the steamer San Jacinto.

THE MARKETS.

Liverpool, Friday Evening, Aug. 29.—Cotton.—The market is unchanged, except for Orleans fair and Mobile fair, which have advanced ⅛. New Orleans fair 7¼; Mobile fair 6⅞; New Orleans middling 6 5-16. The sales for the week amounted to 48,000 bales, including 800 bales to speculators and 8,500 bales to exporters.

The sales to-day will amount to between 8,000 and 12,000 bales, closing dull and quiet at 6⅞ for Upland fair and 6 5-10 for middling. Stock, exclusive of shipboard, 762,000 bales, including 613,000 bales of American cotton.

Manchester advices are favorable, with a moderate demand at previous rates.

KANSAS.—*Washington, September* 12.—It is understood that both Governor Geary and General Smith have been informed, by telegraph, that they will be furnished with additional forces, if necessary, to maintain the public peace of Kansas, and bring to punishment all persons who may commit acts of violence or disorder.

Those only who are regularly enrolled by General Smith will be allowed to carry on military operations in the Territory.

MARKETS.

BALTIMORE MARKET.

Carefully prepared to Tuesday, September 16, 1856.

Flour, Howard Street	$7.00 @ 0.00
Flour, City Mills	7.00 @ 0.00
Rye Flour	3.50 @ 4.00
Corn Meal	3.25 @ 3.75
Wheat, white	1.60 @ 1.68
Wheat, red	1.45 @ 1.52
Corn, white	60 @ 65
Corn, yellow	67 @ 68
Rye, Pennsylvania	80 @ 90
Rye, Virginia	68 @ 00
Oats, Maryland and Virginia	34 @ 38
Oats, Pennsylvania	00 @ 00
Clover Seed	8.75 @ 9.00
Timothy Seed	4.00 @ 0.00
Hay, Timothy	00.00 @ 00.00
Hops	14 @ 15
Potatoes, Mercer	00 @ 0.00
Bacon, Shoulders	9¾ @ 10
Bacon, Sides	11½ @ 11¾
Bacon, Hams	10 @ 00
Pork, Mess	19.75 @ 20.00
Pork, Prime	17.25 @ 17.50
Beef, Mess	16.00 @ 00.00
Lard, in barrels	13¼ @ 13½
Lard, in kegs	14 @ 00
Wool, Unwashed	22 @ 24
Wool, Washed	32 @ 35
Wool, Pulled	27 @ 31
Wool, Fleece, common	29 @ 32
Wool, Fleece, fine	40 @ 45
Wool, Choice Merino	40 @ 45
Butter, Western, in kegs	14 @ 16
Butter, Roll	14 @ 17
Cheese	9 @ 9½
Coffee, Rio	11 @ 11¾
Coffee, Java	14½ @ 15

NEW YORK MARKET.

Carefully prepared to Tuesday, September 16, 1856.

Flour, State brands	$6.00 @ 6.40
Flour, State brands, extra	7.00 @ 9.25
Flour, Western	6.20 @ 6.60
Flour, Southern	7.35 @ 7.60
Rye Flour	3.25 @ 3.75
Corn Meal	3.75 @ 3.80
Wheat, white	1.62 @ 1.68
Wheat, red	1.55 @ 1.60
Corn, white	70 @ 73
Corn, yellow	68 @ 70
Rye	88 @ 90
Oats	46 @ 48
Clover Seed	13.00 @ 14.00
Timothy Seed	3.62 @ 4.00
Hay	60 @ 65
Hops	13 @ 13¼
Bacon, Shoulders	8¼ @ 0
Bacon, Sides	9½ @ 0
Bacon, Hams	9 @ 9¼
Pork, Mess	19.50 @ 0.00
Pork, Prime	17.[illegible]2 @ 17.75
Beef	8.00 @ 9.25
Lard, in barrels	13¼ @ 13¾
Lard, in kegs	12¾ @ 13
Butter, Western	14 @ 19
Butter, State	16 @ 22
Cheese	8 @ 9
Coffee, Rio	10¾ @ 11¾
Coffee, Java	14 @ 14½
Wool, Unwashed	00 @ 00
Wool, Washed	45 @ 00
Wool, Pulled	33 @ 00
Wool, Fleece, common	00 @ 00
Wool, Fleece, fine	36 @ 52
Iron, Scotch, Pig	31.50 @ 00.00
Lime, Rockland	1.30 @ 0.00
Lime, common	85 @ 00

[CONTINUED FROM FIRST PAGE.]

the Territories of Kansas and Nebraska, but it did not provide for the repeal of the Missouri restriction; consequently, it was recommitted to the Committee on Territories, and the wishes of the South complied with, and an outrage perpetrated towards the free North, that will never be forgotten, even if it should ever be forgiven, because it was conceived in political bad faith and repudiation, and consummated by political intrigue, corruption, and partisan rewards. When this bill, establishing the Territorial Governments of Kansas and Nebraska, was passed, it was enacted that they should, when admitted as States, be admitted "with or without Slavery, as their Constitutions should provide." But this was not enough for the slaveholding States, and therefore the Missouri Compromise, which forbids Slavery forever north of 36° 30′ north latitude; that time-honored compact, that bill of repose, for which the slaveholding States had received and secured forever their consideration; that bill which was a Southern measure, passed by Southern votes, and claimed as a Southern victory; that bill which was forced by the South on the North.

But, sir, although the North—wronged, as she felt herself to be, by its passage—respected it and acquiesced in it, still the South, with their few doughfaced allies at the North, repealed it, after it had been sanctioned for a period of over thirty years; and this, too, be it remembered, without there being a single petition presented to Congress, asking for it, while public meetings were held throughout the country, denouncing the measure, and thousands and tens and hundreds of thousands of citizens remonstrated, in the most urgent manner, against its repeal; but it was all in vain; and then came the novel experiment of submitting the subject to the people who should come into the Territory. This was done to admit Slavery into the Territory, which that Compromise forbid; and if the North ever submits to its introduction, she will deserve to bear all the reproaches that the South heaps upon her. But of this I have no fear. While the people of the free States are not easily aroused at trifling things, yet, when repudiation of plighted faith stalks abroad, and the black flag of Slavery hovers over the Territories once dedicated to Freedom by a solemn compact, and the thoughts of the oppression and degradation that follow in the train of this social and political curse, the free men of the free North, and free men from all climes, and all time to come, will arise and drive back the lawless invaders and their Border Ruffian army, and erect the star-spangled banner—that emblem of Freedom—where all men may go and partake of the benefits of our free institutions, as provided for by our forefathers, and in accordance with the letter, spirit, and intent of the Missouri Compromise Act. Well, sir, this breach of faith in the repeal of the Missouri Act was effected by making another plight of faith; that is, by providing that the settlers of Kansas "should be perfectly free to form and regulate their domestic institutions in their own way."

On the strength of this last clause, and relying on the fidelity of the Government of the United States, many people from the different States of the Union emigrated to and settled in Kansas; and what has been the result? Has the Executive or Congress kept their promise and executed that law? No, sir; it has not been done; the facts disclosed by the report of the special committee sent to Kansas establish the fact, that, of the 6,331 votes cast in March, 1855, for the election of the Legislative Assembly of Kansas, 4,921 of them were cast by armed bands of the inhabitants of Missouri, who invaded Kansas for that purpose, on that occasion; that only 1,410 legal votes were cast, and a majority of those were for the Free State candidate, though most of the Free State voters were driven from the polls. This invasion extended to all the Council districts, and to all the Representative districts but one, and elected and controlled a large majority of both Houses. The people in the Territory have not been left free, but have had their homes invaded and subjugated; and they are, and their institutions have been, controlled by the people of Missouri, the arms of that State have been used against the Free State emigrants going to Kansas, by the tyrannical laws passed by that Assembly, and more tyrannically enforced by the officers by them appointed. The President of the United States has aided to enforce these laws, passed by usurpation and fraud. The complaints and appeals of the people in said Territory have been made in vain; their representations have been treated with indifference and neglect; the property of the Free State people has been destroyed and stolen; their buildings have been burnt; their printing offices have been suppressed, to prevent their making known the oppression, crimes, and atrocities, under which they were subjected; the people have been hunted out, they have been hung, they have been murdered; their cattle killed in their presence; they have been warned out, one after another, to leave the Territory; they have been driven out of the Territory, by violence, in large numbers. Yes, Mr. Chairman, you may find them fleeing from the midnight blaze of their own dwellings. You may find their bones bleaching on the green fields of this new country. You may find them driven off to a returnless distance from their country and their homes. You may find some of them here, at the capital of the nation, this very day, who have been indicted, by this mockery of justice in Kansas, for constructive treason, imploring the Executive and beseeching Congress to do something, so that they may be allowed to have a fair and impartial trial, by a change of place of trial to St. Louis, or any other place, except in Kansas, where there is not the first principle of justice administered towards Free State men. They ask this, that they may be tried, and then return to their homes in Kansas. Well, sir, up to this time, no measure, except in this House, has been instituted to ferret out the wrong under which the Free State people in Kansas have suffered; and, in my humble opinion, but for the sending out of the committee from this House, civil war would be now raging beyond the limits of the oppressed and outraged infant Territory of Kansas, and more bloody scenes would have been enacted outside than in said Territory. Fortunately, however, for humanity's sake, a majority of this House were true to the great principle at the formation of this Republic, which was to establish LIBERTY AND EQUALITY.

Mr. Chairman, the people of Kansas, thus oppressed and subjugated, have appealed to Congress for relief; they have complained and struggled in vain. They have done as the people of the Territory of Michigan and California have done before them; that is, formed a State Constitution, inviting all to participate therein, and presented the same to Congress for admission; but all such attempts have but brought down on them the reproach of being traitors, and subverters of authority, and, in the language of the Senate's report:

"Abandoned to their oppressors, the Free State people of Kansas have been pursued by them in the same spirit which made the invasion. The acts of said Assembly have by their officers been made the color for all forms of political persecution and oppression. Indictments for constructive treasons and pretended nuisances deprive them of liberty and destroy their property. Under the form of sheriff's posse, armed bands of people from without the Territory prowl over it, and take and destroy property and lives, and intimidate and drive off the Free State people. These people have thus, for several months past, been harassed and scattered, and any attempt at self-defence has been repressed by the Army of the United States, or been declared *constructive treason*, and treated accordingly. The settlers have thus, in large numbers, been driven from their settlements, and from the Territory. This is but a brief and feeble statement of the facts. A full picture of the public atrocities and private violence which have been committed with impunity upon the Free State people of Kansas, would excite and arouse the deepest sentiment of indignation.

"It would seem to be demanded by a sense of common justice, and by what this nation owes as well to the cause of truth as to its own character and self-respect, that inquiry should be made, and usurpation be subdued, and the public faith be redeemed, by redressing all the wrongs produced by such means. This is not proposed, nor is the law of repose to be restored, or the Constitution already formed to be allowed.

"But, instead of this, it is now proposed to consummate the whole, by leaving usurpation in possession of its power, and provide no security for those they imprison, oppress, and disperse, but provide that those *now* there, and those only, shall determine the definitive condition of that Territory, by now forming a State Constitution. This is but to encourage violence by rewarding it with success; that any result of such an experiment will produce definitive national peace and satisfaction, is to suppose the people of this country blind to the power of ordinary discernment, or lost to every sentiment of justice and humanity."

This, Mr. Chairman, is a brief historical statement of the acts of outrage, violence, and crime that the poor unfortunate Free State people in Kansas have been compelled to submit to.

Having thus spoken of the causes of the present crisis in domestic affairs, I proceed to consider the contemplated objects to be attained by the repeal of the "Missouri Compromise Act," which I believe to be THE EXTENSION OF HUMAN SLAVERY INTO KANSAS AND NEBRASKA.

Down to the period of the commencement of the first Congress under General Taylor's Administration, when a small number of Representatives from the South, led by two Representatives from Georgia, [TOOMBS and STEPHENS,] defeated the re-election of Hon. Robert C. Winthrop as Speaker of this House, because he would not commit himself by a pledge on the subject of Slavery, such as no honorable man could give, the principles of the Missouri restriction had been voted for or approved of by most of the eminent and leading statesmen at the South. Even President Polk had approved of it, in the act organizing the Territory of Oregon. But from this period a new doctrine was proclaimed in behalf of the right of the Slave Power to extend Slavery into any of the Territories of the United States, on the ground of its existence prior to the adoption of the Constitution; and therefore it is claimed that Slavery is not dependent upon or subject to any of the provisions of the Constitution. Well, sir, this is a little ahead of any higher law that I know of. I believe we have power over the subject of Slavery in the Territories. So thought and so acted the Congress, in 1820, when the South passed the "Missouri Compromise Act," and when Charles Pinckney wrote the following letter, rejoicing over the result of its passage:

"CONGRESS HALL, *March* 2, 1820,
"3 *o'clock at night*.

"DEAR SIR: I hasten to inform you that this moment we have carried the question to admit Missouri, and all Louisiana to the southward of 36° 30′, free of the restriction of Slavery, and give the South, in a short time, an addition of six, perhaps eight, members to the Senate of the United States. It is considered here by the slaveholding States as a great triumph. * * *

"With respect, your obedient servant,
"CHARLES PINCKNEY."

So thought the Congress of 1784, whose powers on this subject, under the Articles of Confederation, were no greater than those of Congress under the Constitution, when Thomas Jefferson, from the committee appointed to prepare a plan for the temporary government of the Western Territory, introduced the following resolutions, which were adopted:

"That the settlers within the territory so to be purchased and offered for sale, shall, either on their own petition, or on the order of Congress, receive authority from them, with appointments of time and place, for their free males of full age to meet together for the purpose of establishing a temporary Government, to adopt the Constitution and laws of any one of these States, so that such laws nevertheless shall be subject to alteration by their ordinary Legislature, and to erect, subject to a like alteration, counties or townships for the election of members for their Legislature.

"That such temporary Government shall only continue in force in any State until it shall have acquired twenty thousand free inhabitants, when, giving due proof thereof to Congress, they shall receive from them authority, with appointments of time and place, to call a convention of representatives to establish a permanent Constitution and Government for themselves: *Provided*, That both the temporary and permanent Governments be established on these principles as their basis:

"1. That they shall forever remain a part of the United States of America.

"2. That in their persons, property, and territory, they shall be subject to the Government of the United States in Congress assembled, and to the Articles of Confederation, in all those cases in which the original States shall be so subject.

"3. That they shall be subject to pay a part of the Federal debts contracted, or to be contracted, to be apportioned on them by Congress, according to the same common rule and measure by which apportionments thereof shall be made on the other States.

"4. That their respective Governments shall be in republican forms, and shall admit no person to be a citizen who holds any hereditary title.

"5. That after the year 1800 of the Christian era, there shall be neither Slavery nor involuntary servitude in any of the said States, otherwise than in punishment of crimes, whereof the party shall have been duly convicted to have been personally guilty."

This, Mr. Chairman, was Thomas Jefferson's view of the power of Congress over the subject of Slavery in 1784, not only in the Territories, but in the States to be formed out of the Territories. So thought the Congress in 1787, when the Ordinance of that date was adopted, excluding Slavery from the Northwestern Territory. So thought the Congress of 1789, under the Constitution, who recognised and confirmed the Ordinance of 1787, which was approved by George Washington. So thought the Congress of 1800, who passed an act establishing a Territorial Government over the Territory of Indiana, which was approved by John Adams. So thought the Congress of 1805, in their act establishing a Territorial Government over Michigan. So thought the Congress of 1809, in their act establishing a Territorial Government over Illinois; both of which last-named acts were approved by Thomas Jefferson. So thought the Congress of 1834, in extending the jurisdiction of Michigan over Wisconsin and Iowa, which was approved by Andrew Jackson. So thought the Congresses of 1836 and of 1838, in their acts establishing Territorial Governments over Wisconsin and Iowa, which were approved by Martin Van Buren. So thought the Congress of 1848, in their act establishing a Territorial Government over Oregon, which was approved by James K. Polk—Mr. Buchanan being a member of his Cabinet. So thought the Congress of 1853, in their act establishing a Territorial Government over the Territory of Washington, approved by Millard Fillmore. In all of the aforementioned acts, the Slavery restriction or proviso of 1787 was incorporated, and Slavery expressly prohibited. So thought Mr. Webster in 1850, when he said "that these Compromises (1850) comprehend every inch of territory not disposed of by previous legislation." So thought the court, in the case of Jones *vs.* Van Zandt, 2 McLean's Reports, 596. The court says:

"Slavery exists only by virtue of the laws of the States where it is sanctioned; and if a slave escape from such State to a free State, he is *free, according to the principles of the common law*; and recapture in a free State is authorized only by the Constitution and Act of Congress. There is no general principle in the *law of nations* which requires such surrender."

So thought the court in deciding the celebrated case of Prigg *vs.* the State of Pennsylvania, 16 Peters, 540. The court lays down these propositions:

"By the law of nations, no State is bound to recognise Slavery in another State. It is a matter of comity, and not a matter of international right. The state of Slavery is deemed to be a mere *municipal regulation, founded upon*, and *limited to*, the range of the territorial laws."

So thought ex-President Fillmore *when* he wrote the following letter, although he *now* sustains a very different opinion:

"BUFFALO, *October* 17, 1838.

"SIR: Your communication of the 13th instant, as chairman of the committee appointed by the 'Anti-Slavery Society of the county of Erie,' has just come to hand. You solicit my answer to the following interrogatories:

"I. Do you believe that petitions to Congress on the subject of Slavery and the slave trade ought to be received, read, and respectfully considered, by the Representatives of the people?

"II. Are you opposed to the annexation of Texas to this Union, under any circumstances, so long as slaves are held therein?

"III. Are you in favor of Congress exercising all the constitutional powers it possesses to abolish the internal slave trade between the States?

"IV. Are you in favor of immediate legislation for the abolition of Slavery in the District of Columbia?

"Answer: I am much engaged, and have no time to enter into an argument or explain at length my reasons for my opinions. I shall therefore content myself, for the present, by answering all your interrogatories in the affirmative, and leave for some future occasion a more extended discussion on the subject.

"MILLARD FILLMORE."

So thought ex-Chief Justice Greene C. Bronson, of New York, one of the most distinguished jurists in the country, and a leading Democrat of the Hard school. In a letter dated July 15, 1848, after declining an invitation to attend a political meeting, he says:

"Slavery cannot exist, where there is no positive law to uphold it. It is not necessary that it should be forbidden; it is enough that it is not specially authorized. If the owner of slaves removes with or sends them into any country, State, or Territory, where Slavery does not exist by law, they will, from that moment, become free men, and will have as good a right to command the master, as he will have to command them. State laws have no extra-territorial authority; and a law of Virginia, which makes a man a slave there, cannot make him a slave in New York, nor beyond the Rocky Mountains.

"Entertaining no doubt upon that question, I can see no occasion for asking Congress to legislate against the extension of Slavery into free territory, and, as a question of policy, I think it had better be let alone. If our Southern brethren wish to carry their slaves to Oregon, New Mexico, or California, they will be under the necessity of asking a law to warrant it; and it will then be in time for the free States to resist the measure, as I cannot doubt they would, with unwavering firmness.

"I would not needlessly move this question, as it is one of an exciting nature, which tends to sectional division, and may do us harm as a people. I would leave it to the slaveholding States to decide for themselves, and on their own responsibility, when, if ever, the matter shall be agitated in Congress. It may be that they will act wisely, and never move at all, especially as it seems pretty generally agreed that neither Oregon, New Mexico, nor California, are well adapted to slave labor. But if our Southern brethren should make the question, we shall have no choice but to meet it; and then, whatever consequences may follow, I trust the people of the free States will give a united voice against allowing Slavery on a single foot of soil where it is not now authorized by law.

"I am, very respectfully, your obedient servant,
"GREENE C. BRONSON.
"To Messrs. J. COCHRAN *and others, Committee*."

It is true that we are not asked to *enact* laws to warrant the holding of slaves in the Territories, but we are called upon to admit that slaves may be rightfully held in the Territories without law. The very question is made in substance, which Judge Bronson said would leave the people of the free States no choice but to meet it, whatever consequences might follow.

So thought Colonel Benton in 1854, when, speaking of the Compromise of 1820, he said that it "was but a continuation of the same national feeling, the same national principles, that dictated the Compromise extending the line to the Territory which was then known as the Louisiana purchase." But, sir, what need of my quoting authorities to prove the power and practice of Congress over the subject of Slavery in the Territories? It is a power that has been exercised by Congress from the adoption of the Constitution down to and including this very Congress. Sir, it is the grasping disposition of the South to extend Slavery into the Territories, and with it to rule the Government in the future, as it has done in the past, that we have to meet; and while I regret the necessity to enter into such a conflict, now that the South has reopened it with renewed bitterness, sectionalism, and violence, I shall not shrink from any responsibility that it may impose upon me in combating it.

Mr. Chairman, having presented such facts as I deem sufficient to establish the power of Congress over the subject of Slavery in the Territories, I proceed to speak briefly of the opinions and testimony of some of the fathers of the Republic, and the ablest and most cherished of our recent statesmen, against the evils of Slavery and its further extension. In 1786, General Washington said:

"I never mean, unless some particular circumstance should compel me to it, to possess another slave by purchase, it being among my first wishes to see some plan adopted by which Slavery in this country may be abolished by law."

Said Jefferson, in his Notes on Virginia:

"The whole commerce between master and slave is a continual exercise of the most unremitting despotism on the one part, and degrading submission on the other. * * With what execration should the statesman be loaded, who, permitting one-half of the citizens thus to trample on the rights of the other, transforms those into despots and these into enemies, destroys the morals of the one part and the amor patriæ of the other! Can the liberties of a nation be thought secure, when we have removed their only firm basis—a conviction in the minds of the people that these liberties are the gift of God—that they are not violated but by his wrath? *Indeed I tremble for my country when I reflect that God is just, and his justice cannot sleep forever.*"

In addition to this, I hold in my hand a copy of a letter written by Mr. Jefferson, only six weeks before his death, in which he reiterates all of his former opinions and views on the subject of Slavery, and declares that, "living or dying, they will ever be in my most fervent prayers." I regard this letter as one of the most important and valuable of the papers left by Jefferson. It reads as follows:

"MONTICELLO *May* 20, 1826

"DEAR SIR: Persuasion, perseverance, and patience, are the best advocates on questions depending upon the will of others. The revolution in public opinion which this case requires is not to be expected in a day, or perhaps in an age; but time, which outlives all things, will outlive *this evil* also. *My sentiments have been forty years before the public. Had I repeated them forty times, they would have only become the more stale and threadbare. Although I shall not live to see them consummated, they will not die with me; but living or dying, they will ever be in my most fervent prayers.* This is written for yourself, and not for the public, in compliance with your request for two lines of sentiment on the subject.

"Accept the assurance of my good will and respect.
"THOMAS JEFFERSON.
"MR. JAMES HEATON, *Middletown, Butler Co., Ohio.*"

In Mr. Webster's celebrated Marshfield speech, in 1848, he said:

"I feel that there is nothing unjust, nothing of which any honest man can complain, if he is intelligent, and I feel that there is nothing of which the civilized world, if they take notice of so humble an individual as myself, will reproach me, when I say, as I said the other day, that I have made up my mind, for one, that under no circumstances will I consent to the extension of the area of Slavery in the United States, or to the further increase of slave representation in the House of Representatives."

And again, in 1850:

"Sir, wherever there is a particular good to be done—wherever there is a foot of land to be staid back from becoming slave territory—I am ready to assert the principle of the exclusion of Slavery."

Said the noble old statesman of Kentucky, Henry Clay, in 1850:

"I have said that I never could vote for it myself; and I repeat, that I never can and never will vote, *and no earthly* power ever will make me vote, to spread Slavery over territory where it does not exist."

With this declaration of Mr. Clay I take my stand. It was my privilege to be one of his humble but true supporters while living—even when Kentucky and the South forsook him in the National Convention at Philadelphia in 1848; and now that he is dead, I revere his memory, and will defend his illustrious fame.

Mr. Chairman, having spoken of the causes and objects of the Slave Power in the present crisis, and given the action of Congress, the decisions of the courts, and the opinions and views of Jefferson, Webster, Clay, Fillmore, Bronson, and Benton, respecting the power of Congress over the institution of Slavery, and its extension into the Territories, I beg the attention of the Committee for a short time, while I proceed to speak of the results of the acquisition of territory by the United States, and the manner of its disposal:

1. COST OF TERRITORY PURCHASED.

Territory of Louisiana (purchased of France in 1803)	$15,000,000
Interest paid	8,327,353
Florida (purchased of Spain)	5,000,000
Interest paid	1,430,000
Texas (for boundary)	10,000,000
Texas (for indemnity)	10,000,000
Texas (for creditors, last Congress)	7,750,000
Indian expenses of all kinds, say	5,000,000
To purchase navy, pay troops, &c.	5,000,000
All other expenditures	3,000,000
Expense of the Mexican war	217,175,575
Soldiers' pensions and bounty lands, &c., say	15,000,000
Expenses of the Florida war, say	100,000,000
Soldiers' pensions, bounty lands, &c., say	7,000,000
To remove Indians, suppress hostilities, &c., say	5,000,000
Paid by treaty, for New Mexico	15,000,000
Paid to extinguish Indian tittles, say	100,000,000
Paid to Georgia	3,082,000
	832,764,928

2. HOW HAS THE PURCHASED TERRITORY BEEN DIVIDED?

From the territory thus purchased and paid for by all the States, *five new slave States* have been admitted, having the following extent of territory and representation in Congress:

States.	*Sq. miles.*	*Senators.*	*Reps.*
1 Louisana	41,346	2	4
2 Missouri	65,037	2	7
3 Arkansas	52,191	2	2
4 Florida	59,268	2	1
5 Texas	325,369	2	2
Five slave States	543,369	10	16

The free States, if any, are yet to be admitted.

3. EXTENT, POPULATION, AND REPRESENTATION, OF THE FREE AND SLAVE STATES.

Free States.	*Sq. miles.*	*Population.*	*Sen.*	*Rep.*
1 New York	46,000	3,048,325	2	33
2 Pennsylvania	47,000	2,258,160	2	25
3 Ohio	39,964	1,955,050	2	21
4 Massachusetts	7,250	985,450	2	11
5 Indiana	33,809	977,154	2	11
6 Illinois	55,409	846,034	2	9
7 Maine	35,000	581,813	2	6
8 New Jersey	6,851	465,509	2	5
9 Michigan	56,243	395,071	2	4
10 Connecticut	4,750	363,099	2	4
11 N. Hampshire	8,030	317,456	2	3
12 Vermont	8,000	313,402	2	3
13 Wisconsin	53,924	304,756	2	3
14 Iowa	50,914	191,881	2	2
15 R. Island	1,200	143,875	2	2
Fifteen States	454,344	13,347,035	30	142

(Omitting California, as before.)

Slave States.	*Sq. miles.*	*Population.*	*Sen.*	*Rep.*
1 Virginia	61,352	894,800	2	13
2 Kentucky	37,680	761,413	2	10
3 Tennessee	44,000	756,836	2	10
4 Missouri	65,037	592,004	2	7
5 N. Carolina	45,500	553,028	2	8
6 Georgia	58,000	521,572	2	8
7 Alabama	50,722	426,514	2	7
8 Maryland	11,000	417,943	2	6
9 Mississippi	47,151	295,718	2	5
10 Louisiana	41,346	255,491	2	4
11 S. Carolina	28,000	274,563	2	6
12 Arkansas	52,198	162,189	2	2
13 Texas	325,520	154,034	2	2
14 Delaware	2,120	71,169	2	1
15 Florida	59,268	47,203	2	1
Fifteen States	928,894	6,184,404	30	90

POPULATION.

Fifteen free States contain	13,347,035
Fifteen slave States contain	6,184,404

TERRITORY.

	Sq. miles.
Fifteen slave Sates contain	928,894
Fifteen free States contain	454,344
Difference	474,556

The fifteen slave States have now above five times the extent of territory, according to population, that the free States have. Including slaves and all, they have about three times the territory of the free States, according to population.

	Sq. miles.
Nine slave States have been added, containing	722,922
Six free States have been added, containing	290,264
Difference	432,658

I have given the cost of the purchased territories, the disposition of the same, the population of the free and slave States, together with the extent of the entire territory embraced in said States in the Union, omitting California, as she was admitted without cost, and I may say by accident. It is also true, she was admitted as a free State, but her Senators and Representatives soon learned in whose hands the power of this Government is held, and have ever been, politically, the allies of the slave States; California "forms no part of the territory where the struggle for and against the extension of Slavery has been carried on." I now submit a statement of

THE SLAVE POWER.

States.	*Slaveholders in each.*
Alabama	29,295
Arkansas	5,999
Delaware	809
Florida	3,250
Georgia	38,456
Kentucky	38,385
Louisiana	20,670
Maryland	16,040
Mississippi	23,116
Missouri	19,185
North Carolina	28,303
South Carolina	25,596
Tennessee	33,864
Texas	7,747
Virginia	55,063
Total	346,047

"Thus it will be seen that the number of slave-owners, including men, women, and children, is only about three hundred and forty-six thousand, and the free white population over six millions, in the slave States—or only about one in twenty of the white population in the slave States are slave-owners. Yet this small number, by a union of interest, and by the political importance given to Slavery, rule these States absolutely and despotically; the great majority of the people—a majority of nearly *twenty to one*—are never heard of, and have no more power in those States, *politically*, than the slaves its *aristocratic rulers* own! This is truly astonishing! But the condition of the General Government is more so. The free population of the Union is about twenty millions. The slave-owners now number some three hundred and forty-six thousand. For the past sixty-years, their numbers would average from one hundred and fifty to two hundred thousand; yet the General Government is in their hands, and has been for the past fifty years, when the majority against them in the Union is as *sixty to one*; still they hold the power, and the Government is directed and controlled by them, and has been almost ever since it has been in operation. And during all that time, more than *one-half* of all the important offices of the Government—and I believe nearly *two-thirds* of those offices—have been filled by slaveholders, to the exclusion of the great mass of the people of the United States!"

The five purchased slave States of Florida, Texas, Arkansas, Louisiana, and Missouri, contain 543,369 square miles.

The whole fifteen free States contain 454,344 square miles.

The territory added to the slave States, by purchase, is larger than all the fifteen free States, by 89,025 square miles.

This excess is a larger territory than is contained in seven of the free States. *And this was all purchased to extend Slavery*, while the free States admitted have been formed out of territory belonging to the United States when the Government was established, and to which the Ordinance of Jefferson and of Freedom, prohibiting Slavery, was applied by the fathers of the Republic.

REPRESENTATION.

The fifteen free States have 13,000,000 of free white inhabitants, the fifteen slave States 6,000,000, yet each have thirty Senators. True, the small States are entitled to two Senators each, as well as the larger ones; but this number of slave States extended over a large territory, with a small population, makes the disproportioned representation of the two sections in the Senate too palpably unjust. *In Senators, the slave States have, by this system, kept up a representation in the proportion of* TWO *to* ONE *as against the free States.*

In the House, the slave States have ninety members, representing 6,000,000 of population; the free States one hundred and forty-two members, representing 13,000,000. Upon the same ratio with the slave States, the free States should have *one hundred and ninety-five members—a loss to them of fifty-three* in the popular branch of the Government—that in which the popular voice is to be heard, and the popular will expressed.

South Carolina has *six* Representatives, with a free white population of 274,563.

New Hampshire has *three* Representatives, with a free white population of 317,456.

Vermont has *three* Representatives, with a free white population of 313,402.

Vermont and New Hampshire, with a population of 630,858, have *six* Representatives.

South Carolina has *six* also, with only 274,563 less by 356,295—not one-half as much.

At the ratio of South Carolina representation, these free States should have *fourteen* Representatives, instead of *six*. Is there not a wide difference in the *political* rights of these States?

Three Congressional districts in New York contain a larger free white population than the State of South Carolina; yet this is the State that is going to force Slavery into Kansas—the one that has so often complained of the hardships of remaining one of the United States, and threatened disunion!

Votes of eleven slaveholding States at the election of 1852, when Mr. Pierce was chosen, as contrasted with the vote of New York.

1. Arkansas	19,577
2. Delaware	12,673
3. Florida	7,193
4. Georgia	51,365
5. Maryland	75,153
6. North Carolina	78,861
7. Texas	18,547
8. Alabama	41,919
9. Louisiana	35,902
10. Mississippi	44,424
11. Virginia	129,545
Aggregate vote of eleven States	515,159
Vote of New York	522,294

Being 7,135 votes more than all the others.

These *eleven* States, (Virginia included,) that gave in 1852 a less vote than New York for President, have *twenty-two* Senators—New York has only *two!*

Slaveholders have political advantages denied to all other men! A man who owns one thousand slaves has the same political power over his slave property as six hundred inhabitants in the free States. His power is superior to that of most of the voters in a town of ordinary size. He has besides, individually, the same political power as the richest man in a free State. This additional right—six hundred strong—is solely in consideration of his owning one thousand slaves as property!

Mr. Chairman it will be seen by the foregoing statements that the cost of territory purchased is $832,764,928. Out of all this territory purchased, but one free State (Iowa) has been admitted.

Mr. Clay admitted this, in his speech made in the Senate in 1850. (See Appendix to Globe, vol. 22, page 126.) He said:

"What have been the acquisitions made by this country, and to what interests have they conduced? Florida, where Slavery exists, has been introduced. All the most valuable part of Louisiana has also been added to the extent and consideration of the slaveholding portion of the Union.

"All Louisiana, with the exception of what lies north of 36° 30′.

"All Texas; all the Territories which have been acquired by the Government, during sixty years of the operation of that Government, have been slave Territories; theatres of Slavery, with the exception I have mentioned, lying north 36° 30′."

Not one inch of territory has ever been purchased or acquired of any foreign Power, since the Constitution was adopted, at the instance of the free States, or which was intended for their benefit.

Yet the free States have paid more than two-thirds of the entire cost of all these acquisitions of territory, and the consequent expenditures since incurred. They have borne their full share in the wars which led to or resulted from these acquisitions, in the expenditure of money, and in the sacrifice of human life.

Mr. Chairman, I have now finished this branch of my remarks, and proceed to consider, during the short time left me, the influences of Slavery, as illustrated by the acts of the bogus Legislature of Kansas, the wrongs and oppression inflicted on the Free State people in Kansas, in this House, and in this city.

Section 13 (page 378) of the laws passed by the Pro-Slavery bogus Legislature of Kansas excludes all but Pro-Slavery men from the jury-box, in all cases relating directly or indirectly to Slavery. Here it is:

"No person who is *conscientiously opposed* to the holding slaves, or who *does not admit* the right to hold slaves in this Territory, shall be a juror in any cause in which the right to hold any person in slavery is involved, nor in any cause in which any injury done to or committed by any slave is in issue, nor in any criminal proceeding for the violation of any law enacted for the protection of slave property, and for the punishment of *crime* committed against the right to such property."

Again: The organic law organizing Kansas provides, in section 30, that the official oath to be taken by the Governor and Secretary, the Judges, "*and all other civil officers in said Territory*," shall be, "to support the Constitution of the United States, and faithfully to discharge the duties of their respective offices." No more, no less. But the legislators of Kansas, with the same disregard of the Congressional law that marked their other acts, enacted another kind of official oath, on page 438 of their code, as follows:

"SEC. 1. *All officers* elected or appointed under any existing or subsequently-enacted laws of this Territory, shall take and subscribe the following oath of office: 'I, ——, do solemnly swear, upon the holy Evangelists of Almighty God, that I will *support* the Constitution of the United States, and that I will *support and sustain* the provisions of an act entitled 'An act to organize the Territories of Nebraska and Kansas,' and the provisions of the law of the United States commonly known as the '*Fugitive Slave Law*,' and faithfully and impartially, and to the best of my ability, demean myself in the discharge of my duties in the office of ——, so help me God."

You cannot fail to notice that, in this new oath, framed by the bogus Legislature, the Fugitive Slave Law is elevated to a "higher law" than the Constitution; for the officer is merely to "support" the latter, but is required to swear that he will "support AND SUSTAIN" the other.

On pages 604 and 605, chapter 151, will be found "An act to punish offences against slave property." It is in violation of the Constitution of the United States. Section 12 of that chapter reads:

"If any free person, *by speaking* or by writing, assert or *maintain that persons have not the right to hold slaves in this Territory*, or shall introduce into this Territory, print, publish, write, circulate, or cause to be introduced into this Territory, written, printed, published or circulated, in this Territory, *any book*, paper, magazine, pamphlet, or circular, *containing any denial* of the right of persons to hold slaves in this Territory—such person shall be deemed GUILTY OF FELONY, and punished by imprisonment at hard labor for a term of not less than two years."

Again: In violation of the Constitution of the United States, "abridging the freedom of the press," is the 11th section of the same law in the Kansas code, page 605:

"If any person *print, write*, introduce into, publish, *or circulate*, or cause to be *brought into*, printed, written, published, or *circulated*, or shall knowingly aid or assist in bringing into, printing, publishing, or circulating, within this Territory, any *book, paper*, pamphlet, magazine, handbill, or circular, containing any statements, *arguments, opinion, sentiment*, doctrine, advice, or innuendo, *calculated* to produce a *disorderly*, dangerous, or rebellious disaffection among the slaves in this Territory, or to induce such slaves to escape from the service of their masters, or to resist their authority—he shall be guilty of felony, and be punished by imprisonment and hard labor for a term not less than five years."

And, under this atrociously unconstitutional provision, a man who "brought into" the Territory of Kansas a copy of "Jefferson's Notes on Virginia," which contains an eloquent and free-spoken condemnation of Slavery, could be convicted by one of "Sheriff Jones's" juries as having introduced a "book" containing a "sentiment" "calculated" to make the slaves "disorderly," and sentenced to five years' hard labor.

On page 325, section 12, of this same law, there is a singular provision:

"*If* the plaintiff be *a negro or mulatto*, he is required to prove his right to freedom."

On page 282 is the following:

"SEC. 11. Every free white male citizen of the United States, and every free male Indian who is made a citizen by treaty or otherwise, and over the age of twenty-one years, who shall be an *inhabitant* of this Territory, and of the county or district in which he offers to vote, and shall have paid a Territorial tax, shall be a qualified elector for all elective offices. And all Indians who are inhabitants of this Territory, and who may have adopted the customs of the white man, and who are liable to pay taxes, shall be deemed citizens: *Provided*, That no soldier, seaman, or marine, in the regular army or navy of the United States, shall be entitled to vote, by reason of being on service therein: *And provided, further*, That no person who shall have been convicted of any violation of any provision of an act of Congress, entitled 'An act respecting fugitives from justice, and persons escaping from the service of their masters,' approved February 12, 1793; or of an act to amend and supplementary to said act, approved 18th September, 1850—whether such conviction were by criminal proceeding or by civil action, for the recovery of any penalty prescribed by either of said acts, in any courts of the United States, or of any State or Territory, of any offence deemed infamous—shall be entitled to vote at any election, or to hold any office in this Territory: *And provided, further*, That if any person offering to vote shall be challenged and required to take an oath or affirmation, to be administered by one of the judges of the election, that he will *sustain* the provisions of the above-recited acts of Congress, and of the act entitled 'An act to organize the Territories of Nebraska and Kansas,' approved May 30, 1854, and shall refuse to take such oath or affirmation, the vote of such person shall be *rejected*."

Merely being an "inhabitant," if the person is in favor of the Nebraska bill and of the Fugitive Slave Law, qualifies him as a voter in all the elections of the Territory *affecting National or Territorial politics*. The widest possible door is opened for the invaders to come over and carry each successive election as "inhabitants" for the time being of the Territory. But, turn to page 750, and notice the following provision, (section 8,) defining the qualifications of voters at the petty corporation elections of Lecompton:

"All free white male citizens who have arrived to the full age of twenty-one years, and who shall be entitled to vote for Territorial officers, and who shall have *resided* within the city limits at least *six months* next preceding any election, and, moreover, who shall have paid a city tax or any city license according to ordinance, shall be eligible to vote at any ward or city election for officers of the city."

Being an inhabitant a day clothes a person with the right to vote for Delegates in Congress and Representatives in the Legislature; but to vote at an insignificant election, in comparison, six months' residence is required! Am I wrong in judging that this inverting the usual rule shows that Missourians are wanted at the one election, but not at the other? If any one deems this opinion unjust, let him study the following sections of the General Election Law, page 283:

"SEC. 19. Whenever any person shall offer to vote, he shall BE PRESUMED *to be entitled to vote*.

"SEC. 20. Whenever any person offers to vote, his vote may be challenged by one of the judges, or by any voter, and the judges of the election may examine him touching his right to vote; *and if so examined*, NO EVIDENCE TO CONTRADICT SHALL BE RECEIVED."

These provisions explain themselves without comment.

Section 5 of the act punishing offences against slave property, (page 604,) enacts as follows:

"If any person shall *aid or assist* in enticing, decoying, or *persuading*, or carrying away, or *sending out of* this Territory, any slave belonging to another, with intent to procure or effect the freedom of such slave, or with intent to deprive the owner thereof of the services of such slave, he shall be adjudged guilty of grand larceny; and on conviction thereof *shall suffer death*, or be imprisoned at hard labor for not less than ten years."

Time will not permit me to go further into these Kansas laws, which Senator Clayton declared to be an outrage upon "the rights of the people and the civilization of the age in which we live," while the *Detroit Free Press*, the organ of General Cass," declared:

"But the President should pause long before treating as 'treasonable insurrection' the action of those inhabitants of Kansas who deny the binding authority of the Missouri-Kansas Legislature; for, in our humble opinion, a people that would not be inclined to rebel against the acts of a legislative body *forced upon them by fraud and violence, would be unworthy the name of American. If there was ever justifiable cause for popular revolution against a usurping and obnoxious Government, that cause has existed in Kansas.*"

But, sir, notwithstanding this appeal, the President of the United States has declared, in his special message to Congress, in his proclamation, and in his orders to Governor Shannon and Colonel Sumner, through his Secretary of State and Secretary of War, that this code of Territorial laws shall be enforced by the full exercise of his power. He knows of their provisions. He knows these laws are in violation of the organic law organizing the Territory, which he signed. He knows they are in violation of the Constitution of the United States, which he and we have sworn to support; and yet, on the 27th of January last, in his special message to Congress, he said:

"Our system affords no justification of revolutionary acts; for the constitutional means of relieving the people of unjust administrations and laws, by a change of public agents and by repeal, ARE AMPLE."

Again: In his speech, as reported in the *Union*, of June 10th, made to the Buchanan ratification meeting, who marched to the White House, he coolly told them:

"There will be, on your part, no appeal to unworthy passions, no inflammatory calls for a second revolution, like those which are occasionally reported as coming from men who have received nothing at the hands of their Government but protection and political blessings, no declaration of resistance to the laws of the land."

But, Mr. Chairman, I will not stop to allude to the "protection and political blessings" which the people of Kansas have received from the "hands of their Government." Let the free citizens, driven from Kansas, with the sound of artillery ringing in their ears, and the light of their burning habitations flashing upon their eyes, as they turned to look back to the homes where they had been forced to leave their wives and children at the mercy of worse than barbarian foes, answer! Let the innocent blood of Dow, Barber, and Brown, and other murdered freemen, that has stained the soil of Kansas, rise up and bear witness against these false charges of the President of the United States!

The Democratic Convention at Cincinnati denounced "treason and armed resistance to these laws" in a marked and special manner. If there was any doubt as to the object of this declaration, the speech of the Senator from Illinois, [Mr. DOUGLAS,] at the ratification meeting in this city, a short time since, removes it. The Washington *Union* of June 10th contained these extracts of that Senator's speech:

"The platform was equally explicit in reference to the *disturbances* in relation to the Territory of *Kansas*. It declared treason was to be punished, and resistance to the laws was to be put down. * * *

"He rejoiced that the Convention, by a unanimous vote, had approved of the creed that law must and shall prevail. [Applause.] He rejoiced that we had a standard-bearer [Mr. Buchanan] with so much wisdom and nerve as to enforce a firm and undivided execution of *those laws*."

This, Mr. Chairman, leaves no room to doubt as to the course of policy to be pursued by the Democratic party towards Kansas. I confess, sir, that on the announcement of the nomination of Mr. Buchanan at Cincinnati, I entertained some hope that he would rise above the party shackles of the day, and use his power and influence in restoring peace and order in Kansas.

But these hopes were of short duration. On the 9th of June last, he made the following speech at Wheatland, which I copy entire from a leading Democratic paper, published at Lancaster, Pennsylvania:

Speech of Mr. Buchanan.

"LANCASTER, PA., *June* 9, 1856.

"The Keystone Club of Philadelphia, accompanied by Beck's Brass Band, arrived here on Sunday, at 11 o'clock, A. M., and this morning paid a visit to the Hon. James Buchanan, at Wheatland, accompanied by a procession of citizens, to the number of two or three hundred. Upon their arrival at Wheatland, Wm. B. Rankin, Esq., President of the club, was introduced to Mr. Buchanan, and said that on behalf of the Keystone Club, over which he had the honor of presiding, he congratulated him as the nation's choice, adding, that the work which was but begun, they intended to carry on until victory should crown their efforts. Mr. Buchanan replied as follows:

"'GENTLEMEN OF THE KEYSTONE CLUB: I give you a most hearty and warm welcome to my abode. I congratulate you, not upon my nomination, but upon the glorious privilege of being citizens of our great Republic. Your superiority over the people of other countries has been fully demonstrated by the conduct of a vast concourse assembled during the past week at Cincinnati. Upon any similar occasion in Europe, the voluntary expression of the people would have been drowned in martial music, and their actions controlled by an army with banners. How unlike the spectacle at Cincinnati, where delegates from the people of the different States met in convention, under protection of the Constitution and laws, and harmoniously deliberated upon subjects of vital importance to the country. Gentlemen, two weeks since I should have made you a longer speech, but now I have been placed *upon a platform, of which I most heartily approve, and that can speak for me. Being the representative of the great Democratic party, and not simply James Buchanan, I must square my conduct according to the platform of that party, and insert no new plank, nor take one from it. That platform is sufficiently broad and national for the whole Democratic party.* This glorious party, now more than ever, has demonstrated that it is the true conservative party of the Constitution and of the Union.'

"PHILADELPHIA, PA., *June* 9, P. M.

"The Keystone Club arrived in this city this evening. They were met at West Philadelphia by a deputation of citizens, who, with music, escorted them through the principal streets, the procession increasing in numbers until the ranks numbered 2,000. A salute of fifty guns was fired."

Again: In his speech at Baltimore, on the occasion of his recent public reception in that city, he said:

"We have already reached and almost passed the dangerous crisis on the subject of domestic Slavery. The volcano is nearly exhausted. The material for continued agitation no longer exists. And why? Because I hold it to be quite impossible that any considerable portion of our people can long continue to contest the elementary republican principles recognised in the Territorial legislation of Congress."

Well, sir, here we have him square on the Cincinnati platform; no longer James Buchanan, but merged into and "square" to this platform, which declares: "The American Democracy recognise and adopt the principles contained in the organic laws establishing the Territories of Kansas and Nebraska, as embodying the only sound and safe solution of the Slavery question; that this was the basis of the Compromise of 1850." I have shown what the organic laws establishing these Territories were. I have also shown the violation of them by the bogus Legislature of Kansas, and their approval by the President, and now by the Democratic Cincinnati Convention. I have also shown the declaration and pledge of the Senators and Representatives in Congress in 1850, and its full endorsement by the President, in his first annual message to Congress in 1853. I have also shown the faithlessness in the President and his supporters in adhering to these pledges. I have also shown the repudiation of all these professions and pledges by the President and his supporters; and with this exposé I leave him and them to reflect on their inconsistency and wrong, which he and they have inflicted on the rights of the people and the stability of the institutions of the country.

Mr. Chairman, in passing to the consideration of other topics, I deem it proper to call the attention of the House to the state of affairs in the State of California, and the conduct of the President of the United States in relation to the same. It is as well known as it is disgraceful to the nation, that a state of insubordination and anarchy has existed in that sovereign State for months; and that, instead of the laws of that State, or of the United States, being enforced there, a self-constituted committee has usurped the liberties of the people, set aside the ministers of the law, and taken the administration and the execution of their self-enacted laws into their own hands. The legally-constituted authority of that State, by their Governor, has applied to the President of the United States for aid to enforce the laws, and restore order in California; but the appeal has been denied, and no one can now tell when order and the majesty of the law will again be restored in that unfortunate State. I enter into no speculation as to who is right or wrong for the existing state of things in California, or upon the motives of the President and his advisers, in refusing aid to the constituted authorities of that State, to put down the insurrectionists, and to restore peace and order. But I wish to say that his conduct in this case is very unlike that which he has caused to be enforced on the Free State men in the infant Territory of Kansas, in the execution of the bogus and unconstitutional laws passed by the bogus and illegal Legislature of that Territory.

Mr. Chairman, I now beg the attention of the Committee to the consideration of the

ARROGANCE AND SECTIONAL INFLUENCE OF SLAVERY.

During the long contest, at the commencement of the present session of Congress, for the election of Speaker, a leading and distinguished member from Alabama [Mr. WALKER] proclaimed: "Members from the North seem to think that the reason why the South has had so large a share in our governmental operations, lies in the institution of Slavery. I tell them they are mistaken; it lies behind that institution. It is to be found in the administrative faculty belonging to the early settlers of the South—the Cavaliers and Huguenots—AND WHICH THEIR DESCENDANTS HAVE INHERITED." Well, sir, I rejoice in the boldness of this boast of superiority of birth and blood. I respect and honor the frank expression of one's sentiments, as thus given; but I tell the gentleman that he is mistaken in the true character of the people of the North. True, they have not enjoyed the advantage of experience that the people of the South have in the governmental affairs of the Government, but this is solely owing to the sectional and aggressive demands of the Slave Power. But, sir, the people of the North will not longer remain under this vain and boasting charge; they intend to demand and expect to receive and take their fair and just proportion of the responsibilities in the administration of this Government. They commenced this policy in the election of Speaker Banks, without, I regret to say, the aid of a single vote from a slave State. Yet such is the power of Slavery, that even Representatives have to bow to its demands and behests, or to go into private life.

If the people of the North are true to themselves, true to the best interests of the country, true to the Constitution and Union, as I know them to be, they will take the affairs of this Government into their own hands on the 4th of March next; and then the gentleman from Alabama will have an opportunity of witnessing the honor, capacity, and justice, of the people of the North, to administer the affairs of the Government.

I know, Mr. Chairman, that the South sneer at the people of the North, and proclaim that, although they are the descendants of the Puritans of Plymouth Rock, and admit that the sods of Lexington, and Concord, and Bunker Hill, and Saratoga, and Monmouth, and Trenton, and Valley Forge, are their forefathers' sepulchres, in fighting the battles and in achieving the liberties of the country, yet they are only considered an industrious and money-making people, disqualified for administrative positions—fit subjects, I suppose they think, to be the hewers of wood and the drawers of water for the South.

Again: The honorable gentleman from Alabama continues: "Why, sir, I might ask, What great sentiment, what great governmental principle, originated at the North?" I answer the gentleman's question with great pleasure and satisfaction. The great "sentiment" of the North is FREEDOM, and their "governmental principle" PROGRESS. With these principles she started in the great race on this Continent. In the very year the Pilgrim Fathers landed on Plymouth Rock, slaves landed in Virginia; and, in the language of the eloquent gentleman from Massachusetts, "Freedom has gone on, trampling down barbarism, and planting States—building the symbols of its faith by every lake, and every river, until now the sons of the Pilgrims stand by the shores of Pacific. Slavery has also made its way toward the setting sun. It has reached the Rio Grande on the South; and the groans of its victims, and the clank of its chains, may be heard, as it slowly ascends the western tributaries of the Mississippi river. Freedom has left the land bespangled with free schools, and filled the whole heavens with the shining towers of religion and civilization. Slavery has left desolation, ignorance, and death, in its path. When we look at these things; when we see what the country would have been, had Freedom been given to the Territories; when we think what it would have been but for this blight in the bosom of the country; that the whole South—that fair land God has blessed so much—would have been covered with cities, and villages, and railroads, and that in the country, in the place of twenty-five millions of people, thirty-five millions would have hailed the rising morn, exulting in Republican Liberty—when we think of these things, how must every honest man, how must every man with brains in his head or heart in his bosom, regret that the policy of old Virginia, in her better days, did not become the animating policy of this expanding Republic!"

FREEDOM AND PROGRESS.

Sir, that develops the material resources of the country; that builds railroads and canals; that protects and respects the labor of every citizen of the country; that protects the rights of every American citizen, at home and abroad; that encourages commerce, that twin-sister of civilization, that encourages emigration; that contributes "labor, capital, art, valor, and enterprise, to perfect and embellish our ever-widening empire." These sir, are the aims and trophies of Freedom and Progress. Now, sir, may I not ask, What are the aims and trophies of the institution of Slavery? *Is it not sectional and aggressive? Is it not a cruel*, relentless tyranny? Does it not legalize "CHATTEL SLAVERY"—that "execrable commerce," as Jefferson called it, "that makes merchandise of immortality; that smites the earth with barrenness; that blasts the human intellect, and blights the human heart; that maddens the human brain, and crushes the human soul; that crime which puts out the light and hushes the sweet voices of home, shatters its altars and scatters darkness and desolation over its hearthstone; that system which recognises the tearing away of joyful children from their mothers' arms, and selling them into eternal exile, without having anything to say in the premises; that system which dooms men to live without knowledge, to toil without reward, to die without hope; that system which sends little children to the shambles;" and, let me add, that system, which custom sanctions, of fathers selling their own children into Slavery.

Mr. Chairman, in conclusion, I charge that Slavery is not only *sectional* and *aggressive, but that its social influence is corrupt and dangerous to the best interests of the community in which it exists.* Why, sir, I have but to call the attention of the Committee to what has transpired in this House and in this city, since the commencement of the present session of Congress, to establish these charges to the conviction of every candid and impartial mind. In this House there are three political parties—Democratic, Republican, and American. At the Congressional caucus of the Democratic party, a resolution was adopted, denouncing the American party, and proclaiming its adherence to the Kansas and Nebraska act. Well, sir, you and this House, and the country, know the long and bitter struggle that ensued, before the election of a Speaker; the denunciations that were uttered by the Democrats against the Americans as well as the Republicans; and yet, sir, notwithstanding all this, and the further consideration, too, that many members of the American party South were Anti-Nebraska men, and some of them opponents of it in the last Congress, yet, on the final vote, every member of that party present from the South voted for the Democratic nominee, except two members, [Mr. CULLEN and Mr. DAVIS,] who voted for the American candidate. Why, sir, let me ask, was this sectional vote given? Was it not in consequence of the sectionalism of Slavery?

Again: When the telegraph wires, day after day, brought the tidings of the invasion of Kansas by the border ruffians from the State of Missouri, and the reign of anarchy and civil war in the Territory of Kansas, a proposition was introduced by the gentleman from Indiana, [Mr. DUNN,] appointing a committee from this House to go to Kansas and investigate the alleged frauds in that Territory. Well, sir, on this fair, just, and peaceful proposition—a proposition, in my opinion, that saved the lives and property of hundreds and thousands of the people of that unfortunate Territory—not a man voted for it from a slave State.

Again: When the gentleman from Maine [Mr. KNOWLTON] offered a resolution of inquiry respecting the murder of Thomas Keating, the Irish waiter at Willard's, by Mr. HERBERT, a member of this House, every member from the slave States, except one, voted against it, as did every member present of the Democratic party, except two, [Mr. KELLY and Mr. WILLIAMS.] Yeas 70, nays 79, was the vote.

Is Slavery not sectional and aggressive? Or is the murder of a poor Irish waiter not worth investigating?

Again: On the vote admitting Mr. ARCHER, of Illinois, to his seat, on the report of the Committee on Elections, every member present and voting from the slave States voted against his admission. ARCHER is an American Republican.

Again: On the vote to expel the Hon. PRESTON S. BROOKS, and to censure the Hon. LAWRENCE M. KEITT, members of this House from the State of South Carolina, for the brutal and murderous assault on the Hon. CHARLES SUMNER, a Senator from the State of Massachusetts, for words spoken in debate, in the Senate of the United States, and in reply to Senator BUTLER, of South Carolina, and of the institution of human Slavery in the slave States, and not for any act done or word spoken by that Senator, to or reflecting on either of the members referred to above, and which assault was proved to have well-nigh destroyed that Senator's life, *every member present and voting from the slave States, except one in each case, voted against expelling Brooks and censuring Keitt.*

Well, sir, this is not all of this case. The member from South Carolina [Mr. BROOKS] has since said to this House:

"I went to work very deliberately, as I am charged—and this is admitted—and speculated somewhat as to whether I should employ a horse-whip or cowhide; but, knowing that the Senator was my superior in strength, it occurred to me that he might wrest it from my hand, and then—for I never attempt anything I do not perform—I might have been compelled to do that which I would have regretted the balance of my natural life."

Now, sir, without some further explanations, there might be some doubt as to what the member refers to in saying, "I might have been compelled to do that which I would have regretted the balance of my natural life." I am credibly informed as to what he did mean; and it is this, as stated by that member to the honorable gentleman from Massachusetts, [Mr. DE WITT:] that if Senator SUMNER had made an apparent successful defence, he would have *shot him* DEAD! And for the crime and damage of this unexampled assault in the history of our country, Judge Crawford, of the Criminal Court of the District of Columbia, fined the member from South Carolina *the enormous sum of* $300!

Is there no power and influence of the sectionalism of Slavery in this?

Again: On the bill introduced by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. DUNN] for restoring the "Missouri Compromise act," and for liberating the Free State men in Kansas from their unlawful imprisonment, and for reorganizing the Territorial Government of Kansas, every Representative present and voting from the slave States voted against it.

Again: On the report of the Committee on Elections against the right of Whitfield, the Delegate from Kansas, to his seat, on proof of the most reliable and unquestioned character, every Representative present and voting from the slave States voted in his favor. I make no comments on this extraordinary and sectional vote, but refer you to the testimony and report of your committee sent to Kansas to investigate this and other cases of fraud.

This, Mr. Chairman, brings me down to the consideration of

THE SOCIAL INFLUENCE OF SLAVERY, AND ITS CORRUPT AND DANGEROUS INFLUENCE TO THE COMMUNITY WHERE IT EXISTS.

Soon after the commencement of the present session of Congress, and before the election of Speaker, a member of this House [Mr. RUST] assaulted and beat Horace Greeley with a cane. A few days later, another member of this House [ex-Governor SMITH, of Virginia] had a street fight with the editor of the *Star*, (Mr. Wallach.) Next in order is the murder of Keating by a member of this House, [Mr. HERBERT,] and the assault of SUMNER by Messrs. BROOKS and KEITT, of which I have heretofore spoken.

TRIAL OF HERBERT FOR THE MURDER OF KEATING.

Mr. Chairman, I have but a few words more to say on these to me unpleasant subjects. But duty, as well as humanity, demands that something should be said respecting the murder of Thomas Keating, the Irish waiter at Willard's Hotel, by the member from California, [Mr. HERBERT,] and the extraordinary circumstances and facts connected with the action of Judge Crawford, District Attorney Key, and Marshal Hoover, concerning the same.

The murder was committed in the city of the capital of the nation, by a Representative of the American Congress, and under circumstances that has caused the attention of every citizen of the country to it, and the eyes of the civilized world upon it, in consequence of the place where it occurred, and the official position of the man who perpetrated the act.

The magistrates who made the preliminary examination of the killing of Keating issued a warrant to commit Herbert to await his trial for murder. Judge Crawford admitted him to bail. The District Attorney, Mr. Key, did not attend the first examination before Judge Crawford, or make any effort to resist Herbert's application for the privilege of being admitted to bail. On the morning when Judge Crawford made his order admitting Herbert to bail, the District Attorney was present, but said nothing.

Mr. Chairman, it is well known that the District Attorney, Mr. Key, is a warm personal, political, and bosom friend of Mr. Herbert; that he refused to allow the friends of Keating to employ any associate counsel to aid in the trial, until the day before the commencement of the first trial; that he then said to the friends of Keating that he would make application to the court for a postponement of the trial for one day, to enable them to procure an associate counsel to aid him on the trial, but that he omitted to make the application to the court. On the trial of the case, the District Attorney abandoned the charge of murder, and only asked a conviction for manslaughter. It was under the legal advice and direction of this same District Attorney that the grand jurors found an indictment for murder. The motive for this particular form of indictment may not be certain, but its effect and consequences were unmistakable. The indictment being for murder, gave the defendant the right of peremptorily challenging thirty-six jurors. The power to set aside that number without assigning any reason, in connection with the character of the whole body of the jurors summoned in by the Marshal, really gave to the member from California [Mr. HERBERT] the selection of the jury who were to decide upon his fate. *Did the District Attorney foresee, or did he intend, precisely this result?*

It is further said that Marshal Hoover, who has power to sumom jurors at discretion for the Criminal Court of this District, is also a devoted personal and political friend, and heretofore a frequent visiter, of the member from California. It is further charged, that the *bail* of Herbert, before his indictment for the murder of Keating, is a brother of Postmaster Berret, of the city post office, and an officer or subordinate in one of the Departments.

It is further charged, that the member from California [Mr. HERBERT] is a friend of the Administration; that he was a delegate to the National Democratic Cincinnati Convention; that District Attorney Key, Marshal Hoover, and Mr. Berret, received their respective offices by appointments from the President and his Administration.

Well, sir, on submitting the charge to the jury, on the first trial, Judge Crawford, at the instance and request of the counsel of the prisoner, laid down the following principle of law for the guidance of the jury, namely:

"Mr. Bradley asked the Court to instruct the jury upon the points of law, and Mr. Walker immediately rose with a set of instructions framed by the defence, which he asked should be given to the jury. These Mr. Walker proceeded to read, and then passed them up to Judge Crawford, who promptly reported them to the jury as the instructions of the Court.

"These instructions are as follows:

"'1st. If a sudden affray arose between the accused and the deceased, and afterwards several other persons interfered to assist the deceased, and by these assailants the defendant was borne down and beaten, and had reason to believe that he was in imminent danger of great bodily harm, from which he could not safely escape, and while in this position fired the pistol by which the deceased was killed, it was in judgment of law a case of excusable homicide, and it is immaterial, in the absence of premeditation and malice, by whom the affray was commenced. And it is also not material that the accused might have escaped before the imminent peril came upon him, if at the time the peril came he had reason to believe himself in imminent peril of life, or of great bodily harm; and when he fired the pistol he could not safely escape.

"'2. To have authorized Herbert to take the life of Keating, the necessity for doing so need not be actual; for if the circumstances were such as to impress his (Herbert's) mind with the reasonable belief that such necessity was impending, it is sufficient.

"'3d. If the jury believe, from the evidence, that at the time the pistol was discharged Herbert was being pressed by superior numbers, and was in danger of death or of serious bodily harm, and from which he could not safely escape, he was justified in taking life.

"'4th. If the jury entertain reasonable doubts as to any material fact necessary to make out the case for the Government, they must give the benefit to the defendant.'"

Well, Mr. Chairman, I am no lawyer; but if this is law in the Criminal Court in the city of Washington, I do not consider it justice, and I intend, the first opportunity that offers, to offer a resolution which I have drawn up, directing the Judiciary Committee to bring in a bill, before the end of this session, to reorganize or abolish the Criminal Court in the District of Columbia.

The result of the first trial was a disagreement of the jury, and a second trial has since been had, at which I am reliably informed that jurors were SWORN and SERVED, who stated to the Court that they had "formed and had expressed and still entertained opinions respecting the guilt or innocence of the accused." This jury acquitted the member from California, as might be expected they would, after such acts of the Court. This ends my brief history of this most extraordinary trial. In passing, Mr. Chairman I beg to say a word or two to the people of Washington. If such acts of violence and such decisions of courts and verdicts of juries are to be continued, the day is not far distant when a removal of the capital of this nation will be demanded and consummated by the people of the United States.

Again: Even in the State of old Virginia, the mother of Presidents, two citizens—Mr. Underwood and his associate delegate to the National Republican Convention, held in Philadelphia on the 17th of June last—have been compelled to flee from that State, to avoid acts of violence upon them, for no other reason, that I have heard given, than for simply attending said Convention, and giving utterance to their sentiments on the political topics of the day. And yet, sir, public meetings have been held in that State, and resolutions adopted, giving notice to these gentlemen that they must leave the State. I need not say more; the facts are recent, and are before the country.

Again, sir: We hear of and see letters from some of the most leading and controlling men in the slave States—men who have heretofore been Whigs or Americans—coming out in favor of the election of James Buchanan for the Presidency. Among the most recent are Senators Pratt and Pearce, of Maryland, both heretofore leading Whigs; and to-night, sir, we have heard from the lips of the distinguished member from Alabama [Mr. WALKER,] that he, too, follows in the train of the supporters of Buchanan, and for the same principal reasons assigned by the Senators from Maryland, namely, *the safety of the institution of Slavery in the hands of the Democratic party*: a gentleman, allow me to say, who, as it is well known, has heretofore acted with and been a member of the American party; and he has told us to-night that he was a delegate to the National American Convention that nominated Fillmore and Donelson. Yes, Mr. Chairman, I well recollect of the prominent part that gentleman took in that Convention, and of the fact of his being a prominent candidate, and warmly supported by delegates in that Convention, for the nomination of Vice President; a gentleman, let me add, who has recently distinguished himself as the counsel of the member from California, [Mr. HERBERT,] on the trial of that member for the murder of Thomas Keating, the Irish waiter at Willard's Hotel, to which I have heretofore referred. Well, sir, he has gone, and is now in the full embrace of the Democratic party.

Is there no sectional influence in the institution of HUMAN SLAVERY?

THE REMEDY.

THE REMEDY for the present unhappy state of affairs existing between the different sections of the country is in a return to the principles of the early fathers of the Republic, in the admission of Kansas as a free State, for which we have precedents in the admission of Michigan and California, for which we have the approval of Judge McLean, who said in his letter to Chief Justice Hornblower, of New Jersey, on the 6th June last, "I have no hesitation in saying that the immediate admission of Kansas as a State into the Union, under the Constitution already formed, commends itself to me as a measure of sound policy, and well calculated to bring peace to the Territory and to the country."

Or, sir, if the Senate will pass the bill sent to it, restoring the Missouri restriction, which protects the Territory to Freedom north of 36° 30′ north latitude forever, and liberates the freemen in Kansas that are unlawfully imprisoned there, and provides for the reorganization of the Territory until it is admitted into the Union as a State. Are not these just, reasonable, and easy remedies—the true ones to restore peace and tranquillity in Kansas and throughout the country?

THE ISSUE.

Kansas never should and never can be admitted as a slave State. The South should not attempt to increase the evils that are upon us, nor delay action in the vain hope of success. The great question now is, the extension or non-extension of Slavery into free territory. On this question there are but two parties—those who are for it, and those who are against it. It is the great question before which all others sink into insignificance. It is not an unimportant question of the day, but it concerns the stability of the Union, the preservation of the Constitution—that instrument of universal Freedom, contemplated as such by its framers, and interpreted as such by all men, South and North, until within a few years past. It has ever been considered a chart of Freedom, established to secure this boon; giving liberty to the States to do what they think to be proper within their own limits, as to them shall seem to be right and just, but claiming no right and conceding no right to them to carry their own peculiar institutions beyond the limitations conferred by the sovereignty of States. The North asks for nothing more—she cannot and will not consent to anything less.

How momentous the issue! How just and righteous the cause! How certain the result, if the friends of Freedom stand firm, as I have no doubt they will. Let the friends, then, of Free Kansas plant themselves firmly and unitedly on the old Jeffersonian platform of LIBERTY, the CONSTITUTION, the UNION, the SOVEREIGNTY of the STATES, and their full and undisturbed RESERVED RIGHTS. It is on this platform that I plant myself in the approaching Presidential contest. I am for the fullest and amplest justice to the South, and claim the same for the North. Party ties with me are nothing, compared with duty. Yet I know full well that it requires some effort to break loose from our party associations; but I trust, where duty points the way, we shall be found willing followers. For one, I know no party so dear to me as my country, no obligation so binding but to put forth all the energy, strength, and power, that God has given me, to preserve it. If we but do this, when the evening of life is upon us—and it will soon overtake us all—and the sands of this life fast washing away, it will be a consoling thought to be able to cast our memories back to the part we took in this crisis of our country's cause!